

Randolph Town Meeting Notes

Date: May 24, 2006

Ben Mayerson opened the meeting at 7 PM with a brief introduction to the project. David Laurin presented building program observations in power point format and comments and questions from the audience were entertained. Some noteworthy points are as follows:

1. What is the educational model that determined school size being proposed?
 - A. Population trends / studies
 - B. Curriculum offerings – what is the demand for types and numbers of spaces?
 - C. How is core capacity determined?
2. Flexibility: There was discussion about not making the building too small in the core service areas so that the educational programs could be adapted as the needs change over the years both in type of offerings and delivery methods.

For instance, the cafeteria should be able to accommodate a larger seating capacity (more than the usual 1/3 of the student population) to allow more flexibility in scheduling across all grade levels.

Also, remain flexible in classroom layouts to allow changes in technology.

3. Distance Learning Lab: Space need questioned. How many students use this lab? What is in it? What does it do? How was size determined?
4. Stage / Auditorium: Discussion about desire for auditorium space. Town is currently restoring Community Theater and the school will be able to have access to it.

Question: What would the cost to the school district be to use the town facility?

There were mixed viewpoints about the need for a separate auditorium vs. “cafetorium” but in general, some sort of performance space at the MS/HS is desired.

5. Admin Areas: Chart indicates 3 guidance counselors and there should only be 2 at the MS/HS. DL to correct.
6. Gym/PE: Discussion about size of gym and seating capacity. Questions about how the 500-seat bleacher capacity was determined. DL clarified 500 seating capacity as bleacher capacity with an additional 500 seats available on the floor for larger functions.

There was also concern about the overall size of the gym; too big being proposed?

Question about walking / running track in the gym (suspended). Could it be included?

7. Community Services: Question about if MS/HS would offer community access or provide community services for things like daycare, health, other?

Ed Fenn School:

8. Gym / MPR/ Café: Question about gym and if it should have spectator seating.

9. General consensus is that cafeteria function should be separated from the PE function in its own space and that a "cafetorium" works better than a "Gymatorium". Should existing gym become cafeteria / stage and build a new gym or just add café space?
10. Core Capacity: Current enrollment 211. Question about core capacity of 250 students. Is this appropriate? Doesn't correlate to HS core capacity of 400 (current ms/hs enrollment is 344)
11. Grade Configuration: Discussion about grade configuration. Should it be as is or should 6th grade move to Ed Fenn? Should it be K-8? General consensus was that decision should be based on educational benefits and facts.

MS/HS Location: Consensus was to keep the current location if at all possible. Like the idea of the school in the center of town and not remote. Ability to take advantage of town services. Concern about potential disruption during construction needs to be considered.