Side by Side of Staff & Community Coalition Survey #1 Results

Prepared for Cedar Rapids Community Board of Education
January 5, 2026

Survey Group	Survey Window	Number of Respondents
Staff	Dec. 9-16	1,207
Community Coalition	Dec 11-15	54

Section 1: Who responded?

What best describes your relationship to CRCSD? (Please select all that apply)

Relationship Category	Staff Count	Staff % of Respondents	Coalition Count	Coalition % of Respondents
Current CRCSD Staff Member	1190	98.6%	14	25.9%
Current CRCSD Parent/Guardian	260	21.5%	36	66.7%
CRCSD Alumni	161	13.3%	16	29.6%
Former CRCSD Parent/Guardian	134	11.1%	9	16.7
Future CRCSD Parent/Guardian	25	2.1%	4	7.4%
Partner ORganization	NA	NA	5	9.3%
Former CRCSD Staff Member	NA	NA	4	7.4%

What school(s) are you most closely connected to? (Please select all that apply)

School Name	Staff Count	Staff % of Respondents	Coalition Count	Coalition % of Respondents
Bertram	10	.8%	0	0.00%
Cedar River Academy	29	2.4%	0	0.00%
City View	10	.8%	5	9.30%
Cleveland	32	2.7%	1	1.90%
CRVA	3	.3%	0	0.00%
ELSC (District Office)	113	9.4%	4	7.40%
Erskine	35	2.9%	3	5.60%
Franklin	24	2%	8	14.80%
Grant	31	2.6%	3	5.60%
Grant Wood	29	2.4%	3	5.60%
Harding	40	3.3%	10	18.50%
Harrison @ Madison	31	2.6%	1	1.90%
Hiawatha	42	3.5%	3	5.60%
Home School	1	.1%	2	3.70%
Hoover	36	3%	3	5.60%
Jefferson	105	8.8%	13	24.10%
Johnson STEAM Academy	39	3.3%	3	5.60%

Kennedy	137	11.5%	19	35.20%
Kenwood Leadership Academy	40	3.3%	2	3.70%
Maple Grove	40	3.3%	5	9.30%
McKinley STEAM Academy	39	3.3%	7	13.00%
Metro	30	2.5%	3	5.60%
Nixon	36	3%	4	7.40%
Pierce	27	2.3%	3	5.60%
Polk	35	2.9%	2	3.70%
Roosevelt Creative Corridor	30	2.5%	4	7.40%
Taft	43	3.6%	9	16.70%
Trailside	48	4%	5	9.30%
Transition Center	4	.3%	0	0.00%
Truman Early Learning	26	2.2%	4	7.40%
Van Buren	35	2.9%	2	3.70%
Viola Gibson	39	3.3%	5	9.30%
Washington	56	4.7%	12	22.20%
West Willow	35	2.9%	3	5.60%
Wilson	30	2.5%	6	11.10%

Wright	26	2.2%	2	3.70%

How long have you been connected to Cedar Rapids Community Schools?

Connection Length	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
More than 10 years	538	44.7%	39	72.2%
6–10 years	206	17.1%	8	14.8%
1–5 years	358	29.8%	6	11.1%
Less than 1 year	101	8.4%	0	0
Not yet connected but have a future CRCSD student	0	0	1	1.9%

Section 2: Programming

Which types of programming are most important for CRCSD to maintain or expand to drive student achievement and increase enrollment? (Please pick up to 5 choices)

Programming Type	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
Fine Arts (music, theater, visual arts)	747	62.4%	35	64.8%
Athletics and extracurriculars	666	55.6	28	51.9%
Mental health and wellness	660	55.1%	24	44.4%
Early childhood education (Preschool)	653	54.6%	24	44.4%
Advanced Placement (AP)	549	45.9%	24	44.4%
Career and Technical Education	487	40.7%	19	35.2%
Alternative or flexible learning	387	32.3%	23	42.6%
STEM and technology innovation	368	30.7%	16	29.6%
Training in College and Career Connected Learning	298	24.9%	NA	NA
Gifted and advanced learning	276	23.1%	16	29.6%
World language programs	217	18.1%	8	14.8%
Other: (ie: special education, ELL, behavior supports, etc)	75	6.3%	5	9.3%

How important is it to you that every elementary school has full-time specialist teachers for music, art, and PE (currently, some have full-time and some have part-time)?

Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Highest Importance)	582	48.7%	24	44.4%
4	233	19.5%	17	31.5%
3	236	19.7%	5	9.3%
2	76	6.4%	4	7.4%
1 (Lowest Importance)	69	5.8%	4	7.4%

Which preschool model do you most support?

Preschool Model Option	Staff % Support	Coalition % Support
Preschools located within existing elementary schools	64%	70.4%
One centralized preschool building	28.1%	9.3%
Other	7.9%	20.3%

CRCSD is committed to improving student behavior. We have invested heavily in student and teacher support. As we continue to make improvements, what adjustments or additional supports are needed? (Please select all that apply)

Behavior Support Measure	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
More parent involvement and accountability	973	80.8%	46	85.2%
More consistent enforcement of behavior expectations	866	71.9%	45	83.3%
Stronger consequences	884	73.4%	39	72.2%

Additional behavior support staff (Paras, Interventionists)	633	52.6%	25	46.3%
Clarity in behavioral expectations	602	50%	24	44.4%
Additional coaching and professional development	348	28.9$	14	25.9%
I don't know	17	1.4%	1	1.9%
Other (ie: Keep SEBH, support from & accountability for building admin, smaller class sizes, middle school SROs, etc)	51	4.2%	4	7.4%

Section 3: Creating the District of Choice

As we develop the district's new seven-year strategic plan, what does CRCSD need to do to be the district of choice?

- **Safety and Behavior:** The most critical need is to address challenging student behaviors, including physical violence and disruptions, by implementing consistent and meaningful consequences, ensuring a safe learning environment for all students, and increasing support for students with behavioral issues.
- **Fiscal Responsibility and Transparency:** Many respondents emphasized the need for greater financial accountability, stopping unnecessary spending (e.g., on consultants or unnecessary building improvements), and increasing transparency with the community.
- **Academic Focus and Quality:** CRCSD needs to provide a high-quality, traditional education, focusing on fundamental subjects like literacy and math in early grades, holding students accountable for grades, and ensuring learning opportunities for all students, including specialized support and advanced programs.
- **Staff and Community Relationships:** Building trust and improving relationships with families, students, and staff is essential, which includes making staff feel valued, listening to community and parent concerns, and increasing positive publicity and genuine engagement.
- **Facilities and Infrastructure:** While some responses mentioned a need to update facilities to be competitive with surrounding districts, others suggested focusing investment on teachers and academics rather than new or expensive building projects.

What are the deciding factors that led you to choose CRCSD? (only asked of community coalition)

- **Belief in Public Education and Community**: Many respondents emphasize their belief in public schools, their responsibility as parents/residents to invest in the local system, and the importance of neighborhood schools for community strength.
- **Geographic and Residential Factors**: A significant number of responses cite simply living within the district's boundaries, neighborhood school proximity, or initial choice of housing/location as the deciding factor.
- **Staff and Quality Education:** The dedication of teachers and staff is a major reason for choosing and staying with the district. Other factors include a previous good reputation, strong academics, quality education, and specific school programs (e.g., PACT, iJAG).
- **Diversity and Inclusivity**: The district's diversity and its efforts to embrace all students and families were frequently mentioned as key strengths.
- **Employment and Logistics**: Several individuals chose CRCSD due to their employment within the district, which provided aligned schedules and a job opportunity.
- **Alternative Learning and Opportunities**: Specialized options like City View were chosen for flexible, independent, project-based learning. Additionally, the availability of diverse opportunities at large high schools and enrichment programs were mentioned.

- **Negative or Questionable Selection**: Some responses expressed current doubts, regrets about the choice, or stated that nothing specific stood out, and one mentioned a lack of other options.

Section 4: Realignment - Building Consolidations

Scenario #1:
Consolidate PK-5 elementary schools, limiting capacity to approximately 600 students.

Range of Savings Impact:
Approximately $1 Million in operational costs annually per building closed

Potential Benefit(s):
• Full-time specialists in **SOME** building (art, music, PE, library)

• More consistent class sizes across the district

• Less shared staff across multiple buildings

Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	285	24%	16	30.2%
4	291	24.5%	9	17.0%
3	340	28.6%	13	24.5%
2	149	12.5%	7	13.2%
1 (Do Not Support)	123	10.4%	8	15.1%

Scenario #2 - Intermediate School Model
Consolidate schools and reconfigure grade levels to be:

• Elementary schools house Preschool-4th grades limiting capacity to approximately 500 students

• Intermediate schools house 5th & 6th grades limiting capacity to approximately 800 students

• Middle schools house 7th & 8th grades limiting capacity to approximately 800 students

• High schools remain the same (9th-12th grade)

Range of Savings Impact:
Approximately $1 Million-$1.5 Million in operational savings annually per building that is closed

Potential Benefit(s):
• Full-time specialists in **ALL** buildings (art, music, PE, library)

• Stronger extra and co-curricular activities in our middle schools

• More consistent class sizes across the district

• Less shared staff across multiple buildings

• Consistent programming across every school

Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	517	43.4%	16	30.2%
4	358	30%	17	32.1%
3	158	13.3%	7	13.2%
2	77	6.5%	5	9.4%
1 (Do Not Support)	82	6.9%	8	15.1%

Scenario #3: Consolidate Middle Schools
Consolidate 6th - 8th grade middle schools, limiting capacity to approximately 1,000 total students

Range of Savings Impact: Approximately $1.5 Million in operational savings annually per middle school building that is closed

Potential Benefit(s):

• Stronger extra and co-curricular activities in our middle schools

• More consistent class sizes across the district

• Less shared staff across multiple buildings

Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	288	24.3%	13	24.5%
4	303	25.5%	8	15.1%
3	294	24.8%	14	26.4%
2	152	12.8%	10	18.9%
1 (Do Not Support)	150	12.6%	8	15.1%

Scenario #4: Non-Traditional Consolidation
Consolidate non-traditional schools. This would NOT mean eliminating the program, but the location may change.

Range of Savings Impact:
To be determined

Potential Benefit(s):
More integrated and accessible opportunities within our traditional schools (for example, transportation no longer becomes a barrier)

Program	1 - Do Not Support	2	3	4	5 - Strongly Support
City View	89 staff 5 coalition	68 staff 1 coalition	251 staff 6 coalition	187 staff 7 coalition	511 staff 30 coalition
Cedar Rapids Virtual Academy	84 staff 3 coalition	69 staff 2 coalition	268 staff 4 coalition	184 staff 9 coalition	489 staff 31 coalition
Homeschool	114 staff 6 coalition	77 staff 3 coalition	258 staff 4 coalition	172 staff 6 coalition	474 staff 29 coalition
Metro	288 staff 11 coalition	122 staff 6 coalition	247 staff 9 coalition	140 staff 6 coalition	314 staff 16 coalition

Polk	334 staff 12 coalition	133 staff 3 coalition	225 staff 14 coalition	126 staff 5 coalition	294 staff 15 coalition

When do you believe consolidation should begin to take place?

Proposed Start Date	Staff Percentage of Count	Coalition Percentage of Count
26-27 school year	53.9%	45.3%
27-28 school year	46.1%	54.7%

Section 5: Realignment - Cost Reduction Measures

Scenario #1:
Reduce consulting services

Range of Savings Impact:
Up to $1.5 Million

Potential Benefit(s):
• Leverages staff knowledge and expertise to solve current challenges

• Prioritizes funding current student programming

Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	803	67.5%	44	81.5%
4	138	11.6%	7	13%
3	145	12.2%	2	3.7%
2	24	4.5%	1	1.9%
1 (Do Not Support)	49	4.1%	0	0%

Scenario #2:
Reduce ELSC positions

Range of Savings Impact:
Approximately $250,000 - $500,000

Potential Benefit(s):
Realign resources to prioritize current building staff

Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	775	64.8%	38	71.7%
4	197	16.5%	8	15.1%
3	116	9.7%	7	13.2%
2	56	4.7%	0	0%
1 (Do Not Support)	52	4.3%	0	0%

Scenario #3:
Explore sharing services or outsourcing non-teaching positions

Range of Savings Impact: To be determined

Potential Benefit(s):
Ensure resources are maximized and efficiently spent

Support Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	97	8.2%	4	7.4%
4	110	9.3%	8	14.8%
3	269	22.7%	12	22.2%
2	200	16.9%	9	16.7%
1 (Do Not Support)	508	42.9%	21	38.9%

Scenario #4:
Pause adoption or delay purchasing new curriculum for 1-2 school years

Range of Savings Impact:
$1.5 Million - $2 Million

Potential Benefit(s):

• Teachers get space to strengthen their craft with existing initiatives and curriculum before new materials are introduced

• Focus on strong Tier 1 implementation and professional development instead of shifting resources every cycle

• A better long-term investment when enrollment stabilizes and adoption can be done districtwide

Support Rating	Staff Count	Staff %	Coalition Count	Coalition %
5 (Strongly Support)	742	61.8%	42	77.8%
4	255	21.2%	5	9.3%
3	113	9.4%	5	9.3%
2	45	3.7%	2	3.7%
1 (Do Not Support)	46	3.8%	0	0%

Scenario #5: (asked of staff only)
Pay freeze or smaller raise for all CRCSD employees for one year (including all teachers, administrators, and support staff)

Range of Savings Impact:
0% raise saves about $4.2 Million*
1% raise saves about $2.8 Million*
2% raise saves about $1.4 Million*
**compared to cost of standard 3% raise*

Potential Benefit(s):
• Fewer staff reductions
• To be better prepared for unpredictable state funding

Support Rating	Staff Count	Staff %
5 (Strongly Support)	136	11.3%
4	131	10.9%
3	171	14.2%
2	147	12.2%
1 (Do Not Support)	616	51.3%

Scenario #6: (asked of staff only)
Phase out grandfathered insurance stipends (grandfathered insurance is for people who don't take District insurance and receive stipends instead)

Range of Savings Impact:
Potential savings of up to $1.3 Million annually

Potential Benefit(s):
• Fewer staff reductions

Support Rating	Number of Count	Percentage
5 (Strongly Support)	397	33.3%

4	187	15.7%
3	252	21.2%
2	88	7.4%
1 (Do Not Support)	267	22.4%