



Planning and Budget Council

Minutes – **APPROVED**

April 14, 2025

1:30 – 3:00 PM

Attending: Patty Collis, Anne Donegan, Benjamin Goldstein, Malena Hernández, Robert Holcomb, Stephanie Jarrett, Linda Jay, Kate Jolley (also proxy for Angélica Garcia), Sara Jones, Dawn Lukas, Siobhan McGregor-Gordon, Eve Miller, Nick Perrone, Whitney Schultz, Molly Senecal, Sandy Sigala, Jeremy Smotherman, Kim Starke, John Stover

Absent: Maggie Fishman, Angélica Garcia, Ruben Garcia, Shannon O'Reilly, Anthony Spinozzi

Guests: Monica Ohkubo, Debbie Weatherly (proxy for Shannon O'Reilly)

1. Agenda Review and Approval of 03.24.25 Minutes

There was an inquiry regarding a request made at the last meeting for college staffing comparison levels, and it was confirmed the request is included in the minutes. The minutes were approved.

A request was made to move Strategic Enrollment Management Plan Update agenda item ahead of the Strategic Planning Actions Workgroup Update agenda item, however, the Chair decided to proceed with the agenda as originally scheduled.

The Native American Grant update is scheduled to be on the April 28th agenda.

2. Announcements and Questions

Debbie Weatherly was welcomed as proxy for Shannon O'Reilly and Academic Senate Vice President Monica Ohkubo joined the meeting as an observer. It was noted that Academic Senate Executive Committee members taking on committee appointments and leadership roles in the upcoming year will attend shared governance meetings through the semester.

3. Strategic Planning Actions Workgroup Update – John Stover and Jeremy Smotherman

Council members received a [review and update of the strategic planning process](#) which has been ongoing since 2022. As part of that process, the Strategic Plans Actions Workgroup (SPAW) developed detailed action steps aligned with institutional priorities, with the goal of presenting a final Strategic Plan to the Board of Trustees in June. The SPAW was divided into subgroups, each focusing on one of the strategic initiatives, to develop action steps and corresponding success metrics. These efforts were informed by broad stakeholder engagement, including a structured input survey and multiple targeted focus groups involving faculty, classified professionals, administrators, and students. Feedback from these activities were gathered to inform the action steps across the strategic initiatives. These included goals like increasing student persistence, improving access to basic needs services, strengthening partnerships, and promoting sustainability. Each step is accompanied by success metrics intended to measure impact. Following the presentation, members of the council gave feedback including:

- Some success metrics presented differed from those discussed within the workgroup and focus group sessions. It was clarified that the success metrics originated from and were agreed to by the workgroup and, with permission from the workgroup, were refined by Jeremy Smotherman, John Stover, Karolina Nazario and Sarah Pew.
- A Council Member stated they perceived a disconnect between certain proposed action steps, especially those related to academic quality, and the metrics designed to measure their success. For example, the metric for student persistence rates as an indicator of professional development success. The importance of aligning success metrics with the academic goals was emphasized to ensure quality education especially now that the education plan is part of the strategic plan. The

value of professional development in supporting success is already well established, noting that the plan should focus on improving the overall quality of the college, not just aligning with metrics tied to funding.

- Most action steps have measurable success metrics, but those related to disproportionate impact, community responsiveness, and campus climate and culture lacked specific percentages.
- While supporting increasing non-credit program enrollments, some questioned how this metric demonstrates the goal of inspiring students.
- The use of “andragogy” and “universal design” was also brought up suggesting it carried negative implications and lacked accessibility for broader audiences.
- The level of low participation in the survey and focus groups highlighted and led to discussion about the broader issue with engagement across the college.
- There were no references to the California Adult Education Plan and the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in the alignment with federal, state and local initiatives.
- The need for transparency and reinvestment in students and programs to achieve the 17,500 FTES goal to restore the budget.
- As part of the charge, PBC will annually review the Strategic Plan and key performance indicators.

Many of the questions were addressed in the discussion and the remainder will be forwarded to the Strategic Planning Actions Workgroup for consideration in the next step of the process. A key point of confusion emerged around the purpose of the vote, it was clarified that the vote was only to affirm that the planning process of stakeholder engagement and documentation had been followed, not that members were being asked to endorse the content of the plan.

The majority of the Council (13 in favor and 3 opposed) agreed that Steps 1 through 3 of the strategic planning process have been followed, and the plan is ready to move to Step 4. The Strategic Plan Update will be presented as a draft to constituent groups. Feedback and concerns raised in PBC and in constituent group meetings will be taken back to the Strategic Planning Actions Workgroup for further refinement. The revised version of the plan will be presented to PBC in May for review

4. Strategic Enrollment Management Plan Update

Robert Holcomb provided an [update](#) on the progress of the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) Implementation Workgroup. The SEMP is a five-year roadmap with the goal to reach 17,500 FTES by 2027/28. While skepticism was acknowledged, leadership remains confident in achieving this goal due to unmet demand across Sonoma County in areas such as high schools, noncredit programs, and community partnerships.

The seven guiding strategies of the plan are:

1. Schedule Development
2. Data Analysis
3. Organizational Alignment (Guided Pathways, HSI Initiatives)
4. Enrollment Growth and Recovery Opportunities
5. Marketing
6. Student Retention and Success
7. Continuous Improvement

The FTES trajectory has shown steady post-pandemic recovery. Much of the early growth may be due to reopening post-pandemic, but the SEMP strategies are expected to drive future gains, especially in areas with known unmet demand like dual enrollment, work experience, instructional service agreements, lifelong learning, and distance education. Meeting annual benchmarks in the growth areas over the five-year plan would constitute 73% of the 5,000 FTES lost. Questions were raised about the proportional focus of strategies—particularly whether they adequately address the needs of “regular” students who aren’t in targeted program areas. It was noted that broader student populations are supported under other strategies (e.g., retention, success coaching).

Due to time constraint, continuation of this agenda item will be moved to a future meeting.

5. **Accreditation Oversight Committee Update-** Jeremy Smotherman

Due to time constraint, this agenda item will be moved to a future meeting.

6. **Hold Harmless Overview–** Kate Jolley

Due to time constraint, this agenda item will be moved to a future meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

[PBC Committee Function](#)