



**MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS
LEE COLLEGE DISTRICT
FACILITIES MASTER PLAN WORKSHOP
June 8, 2026**

The Board of Regents of the Lee College District met on June 8, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. at John B. Tucker Hall. Vice Chair Warford called the meeting to order stating that the meeting was duly posted, and a quorum was present.

PRESENT: Gilbert Santana, Chairman (6:18 p.m.); Pam Warford, Vice Chair; Mark Himself, Secretary; Gina Guillory, Assistant Secretary; Weston Cotten; Daryl Fontenot; Mark Hall; Judy Jirrels

Jacob Atkin, Interim President

VIRTUAL: Heron Thomas

WORKSHOP – FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

Vice Chair Warford introduced Mr. Chris Laack, Regional Higher Ed. Practice Leader for Pfluger Architects, to brief Regents on master plan progress. With the beginning of June, the project has moved from Phase 1 – Discovery into Phase 2 – Ideation. He said Discovery has involved data collection and immersive work/listening sessions for Pfluger to learn institutional knowledge, pluses, minuses, concerns, etc., that faculty, staff, students and others have.

A Discovery visioning session involved a steering committee of upper level administrators, a working group of college personnel with whom Pfluger interacts on a daily basis, and focus group members who are subject matter experts for particular aspects of the college, Mr. Laack said. Questions presented by Pfluger during the visioning session were based on the college's pillars, such as its strategic plan and academic plans, he said. The visioning session, along with follow up and fine tuning that ensued, resulted in five guiding principles established for Lee College: (1) People-Centered Campus, (2) Future Evolution, (3) Build for Opportunity, (4) Community Engagement, (5) Enduring Identity. Moving forward, these five principles will be used when prioritizing and making decisions related to the master plan, Mr. Laack said.

The Discovery process also included nine workshops: three with the steering committee, three with the working group, and three focus groups, and it involved analysis that produced seven reports: IT/Security, Facility Programming, Facility Assessment, Campus Analysis, Wayfinding Report, Traffic Analysis, and Survey Responses Report. Survey timing was late enough in the spring semester that student input is lacking, so the survey remains open for student input this summer through the beginning of the fall semester, Mr. Laack said.

Among 157 survey responses received, 83 are from staff, 56 are from faculty, and 95% are primarily on the main campus. Mr. Laack noted 89% of respondents say they feel safe walking

on campus. Among things people are least satisfied with include signage and wayfinding, he said. Survey results indicate “quite a bit of consensus” on positives thus far, he said. A resulting four-square diagram reflects (1) positives that should continue to be protected, (2) relatively low-cost opportunities to address desirables, (3) matters of strategic importance for which investment sooner rather than later is suggested, (4) other matters to monitor. Items in #4 were mentioned by survey responders, but not as widely or zealously as items in #3, Mr. Laack said.

Beginning a high-level summary of the Lee College Utilization Analysis of Fall 2024 for classrooms and labs, Mr. Laack said Terry Phillips of Facility Programming and Consulting led this work and provided a full report to Lee College. The data indicates classrooms, when used, average about 2/3 full, but average number of hours used per week is far below the state’s target metric of 38 hours per week. Lab utilization is similar – labs, when used, average nearly 2/3 full, but average number of hours used per week is only about half of the state’s target metric of 25 hours per week. Most classrooms are too small; a few larger classrooms in exchange for the current number of small classrooms would improve efficiency, Mr. Laack suggested.

(At this point, Chairman Santana arrived at 6:18 p.m.)

Facility assessment results developed during May by Alpha Solutions, a consultant for Pfluger Architects, resulted in a Facility Condition Index by which each building is categorized as Good, Fair, Poor, or Critical. Mr. Laack named buildings and the corresponding priority level – from McNulty-Haddick at one extreme (lower priority for attention/action) to Moler Hall at the other extreme (critical priority). In addition, maps contrast condition indexes (Good, Fair, Poor, Critical) for each main campus building one year from now, compared to five years from now. Mr. Laack then discussed expense thresholds for considering demolition of an existing structure and construction of a new building. Such expenses would *not* involve renovation/repurpose of a building for an alternate use, he noted. Also, he warned against inaction for buildings which are OK now, but are projected to become Poor or Critical in five years.

Phase 2 – Ideation involves beginning to focus on priorities identified during Discovery. Planned workshops will feature presentation of various “what if” scenarios, along with focus groups on topics such as student experience, student services, and instructional programming.

Q&A ensued, during which Mr. Phillips of Facility Programming offered thoughts as follows:

- 38-hour-per-week classroom usage metric is based on four-year schools with students in dormitories who attend classes on a five-day-per-week schedule
- For community colleges, a classroom usage metric in 20s is likely more appropriate
- The more classroom is an engaging environment that adds value to in-person teaching/learning, the more students will be attracted to face-to-face instruction, compared to on-line instruction
- Texas A&M asked his company how to design a classroom that is interactive for 600 students
- At some schools, his company is building virtual reality instructional labs
- Having done this work for three decades, he is less confident than ever about what instruction will look like in 10 years – make learning environments as flexible as possible

Topics discussed throughout the course of Q&A included the following:

- Types of detailed information in the full Facility Condition report by Alpha Solutions
- Possible/likely reasons why some classrooms are used less than others
- Possible effects on main campus classroom utilization when Barbers Hill campus opens
- Contrast of teaching strategy when buildings were constructed, compared to education now

- Opportunity now to consider/decide learning environments, use of technology, class size, etc.
- The variety of challenges, depending on the program, that affect enrollment and capacity
- Specialized programs may require facilities/labs not suitable for other use
- Factors in addition to utilization – facility condition, original purpose of building, program need
- Plan is to determine what to accomplish next three years, plus identify options for next 10 years
- Importance of Board understanding this process, to make case later to community for support

MATTERS OF CONCERN FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

None.

Adjournment

Chairman Santana declared the meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Chairman, Board of Regents

Secretary, Board of Regents