

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4
5. Plus/Delta comments:				

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p>★ The activity - Limited Resource Choice was a good addition to the work that has been done.</p> <p>★ Challenging us to expand our thinking - although some were not willing to do so.</p>	<p>★ I was frustrated with the groups that couldn't carry out the Limited Resource Choice activity. They brought their own agendas to the table and were unable to get beyond them. This was not productive for the District.</p> <p>★ Too much of a City of CR. emphasis</p>

**Committee Feedback
February 18, 2013 Meeting**

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Steering Committee

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role after this meeting.				4
5. Plus/Delta comments:				

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p><i>We have general discussion to find group consensus</i></p>	

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4

5. Plus/Delta comments:

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p><i>Small group work then large → group discussion</i></p>	

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4
5. Plus/Delta comments:				

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p><i>Input opportunities</i></p> <p><i>Limited Choice Survey</i></p> <p><i>difficult to complete</i></p> <p><i>at this time</i></p> <p><i>Overall not done</i></p>	<p><i>slow down</i></p> <p><i>- more discussion</i></p>

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4

5. Plus/Delta comments:

Plus (What did you like about this meeting?)	Delta (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
	<p style="margin: 0;">THOUGHT LIST OF 10 COULDA HAVE BEEN PROVIDED EARLIER, MORE TIME TO THINK ABOUT</p>

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4

5. Plus/Delta comments:

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p>6/6/13 6/6 Allowance of free thinking</p>	

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4
5. Plus/Delta comments:				

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p style="font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">Really hard work for this diverse group to come to clear understanding but good conversations, thought provoking.</p>	<p style="font-family: cursive; font-size: 1.2em;">Change Wilson to being a Middle School instead of an elementary. - Polk isn't elementary either</p>

Cedar Rapids Community School District – Facilities Study
February 18, 2013

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Overall, the meeting was well organized.	1	2	3	4
2. The meeting included an appropriate level of participation and involvement.	1	2	3	4
3. Facilities and accommodations were conducive to the work.	1	2	3	4
4. I have a better understanding of my role with the facilities study process.	1	2	3	4
5. Plus/Delta comments:				

<u>Plus</u> (What did you like about this meeting?)	<u>Delta</u> (What could we have done to improve this meeting?)
<p>- Shared discussion with attendees.</p> <p>- Exploring pieces of the plan.</p>	<p>- CRSD staff consistently provide unclear purpose of the work?</p> <p>- be less defensive</p>

**Steering Committee Comments
February 18, 2013**

“Below is a draft set of choices, with consideration to our limited resources and growth potential, please review each choice within your committee team.”

Choices

1. Adjust attendance boundaries to accommodate changes in enrollment.
2. Support inner city development by locating new schools in established areas.
3. Locate new school where population growth occurs including on the outskirts of CRCS D boundaries.
4. Dispose/Close multiple existing schools and consolidate into one existing school(s) with modifications as needed.
5. Dispose/close multiple existing schools and consolidate into one new school(s).
6. Vacate school building(s) and own/maintain for possible future reopening.
7. Do nothing – keep open existing school buildings only and maintain in good/safe condition.
8. Keep open existing school buildings only and invest, expand and improve them as needed.
9. Close and dispose of buildings as needed.
10. Partner with public/private organizations to improve school facilities.

Group Comments

1. Delete 4--don't think we should consolidate schools into existing, not high likelihood of success.
2. Delete 6
3. Delete 7--not an option.
4. Consider setting our proposals as part of this group of options.
5. Number 8; take out word “only”.
6. Take 2 and 5 combined into one---and consider school clusters that are very close together at this time. Example: Arthur and Garfield, Cleveland and Harrison, etc.. Identify schools that are need of replacement. So we're building new, but not duplicating.
7. Not comfortable with any of the ten.
8. Wouldn't support the closing of any school unless there was a clear plan as to how it would be an asset to the community for its future use in the area.
9. Any decisions must have more comparative data-- success stories from other districts. Evaluate the strength of the neighborhood before we invest in a new building - homes, parks, business, etc.
10. Investment in our school system is in tandem with the focus of the city planning and investment--growth, development, repurposing. Place new schools in neighborhoods where the city growth investment will be. For example – New Bo neighborhood.
11. Evaluate some of the innovative approaches---don't invent our own wheel. Review the 5 key priorities to identify successful neighborhoods.
12. Take 9 and 6 off the list.
13. 2 and 5 --question which buildings we'd close to build new in the inner city.
14. Evaluate innovative approaches to successful planning.
15. Data that shows the impact on community of school closings plus school openings.
16. Maintenance, safety in existing buildings is important---the projects really don't belong in the 65 projects that we currently have---but they should be set aside and funded--where is funding coming from to make required upgrades? Should consider the immediate need of maintenance in the schools.
17. Where are we going with the dollars that we currently have?
18. Scored projects low because they didn't fit the criteria, but they are very important.
19. Agree with combining 2 and 5.

**Steering Committee Comments
February 18, 2013**

20. Eliminate 7.
21. See where the closing and holding the building is not appropriate.
22. Planning should consider how learning will change in the future. Colleges are embracing new ways of teaching, will this be embraced by others?
23. Delete 4, 6, 7.
24. Cedar Rapids plan is still being worked on-- completed the comp plan, now working on tier 2 and tier 3---we need to build on that synergy.
25. Some projects fit the criteria, but they could end up representing a school that may merge. Is there a way to document the project and share with other schools for their consideration? Example: Washington HS project---great idea---should we do this at all schools? There are innovative ways to teach that don't require a lot of investment. Should we consider standardizing some of them? Take best practices to other schools. We'd recommend having a group discussion regarding which projects might be considered as standardization.
26. As we consider merging schools, we should review research which speaks to how big or small a school should be. Potential growth and consolidation discussions should include the appropriate supporting study and data.
27. It's real important to be on the same page prior to the data moving forward to the school board. More in-depth discussion is needed to achieve the goal of having a product the board can take to the public to fund the required building needs. Someone will ask what capital improvement costs are required--so how do we get there? Take projects to public to get money.