Workforce Services
Office of Child Care

Wednesday, July 08, 2026
1:00pm – 3:00 pm

Office of Child Care Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

Location: Department of Workforce Services
720 South 200 East
SLC, UT 84111
Conference Room 100

The following link will take you to the power point which was shared throughout the meeting which may be helpful while reading through the minutes: https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1458509.pdf

Link to the agenda:

https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1458321.pdf

Link to the audio recording:

https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1459329.m4a

Committee: Ben Trentleman, Holly Kingston, Cristina Barrera, Jennifer Floyd, Joyce Hasting, Kelly Noorda, Rhonda Dossett, Bree Murphy, Crystal Knippers (for Florencia Schapira De Grout), Missy Sparks, Monica Gailey (for Jody Zabriskie), Johnny Anderson, Katie Ricord, Kristen Schulz, Liliam Llanos, Missy Sparks

Excused/Absent: Florencia Schapira De Grout, Jody Zabriskie, Shauna Tiatia and Anna Robbins-Ek

Interested Parties and Guests: Heather Thomas, Camie Galt, Kari Haugsoen, Jamie Foster, Emma Moench, JoEllen Robbins, Colin Crebs, Janet Johnston, Abigail West, Alison May, Allison Keller, Amber Mabey, C. Dawn Hughes, Camie Galt, Carrie Kingston, Charlotte Tanner, Connie McCullough, Emily Johnston, Hamyanie Johnson, Hillary Christensen, Jamie Galloway, Jared Lisonbee, Jennifer Stout, Jerica Casper, Kathleen Brown, Kathryn Larsen, Kim Melville, Lori Birrell, Madeline Higginson, Mallory Adams, Michele Rice, Monica Gailey, Rachel Miller, Samantha Mafua, Staci Fuller, Susie Estrada, Todd Barnhouse, Trina Valdez, Jeff Sorensen, Kristen Knoche, Vanessa Lowe, Victoria Ortega, Angel Gomez, Lisa McKenzie, Brian Zabriskie, Heidi Petersen, Jamie Allen, Wendy Parker, Lisa Roman, Maryann Stone, Rayn Finley, Sara Jane Schenk and Sharelife54321 (screen name)

Agenda Item	Discussion	Recommendations/Actions
Welcome	A. Joyce Hasting welcomed the Committee and called for attendance. B. Committee Membership - Vacant Positions Parent representing household receiving a child care subsidy from the office Representative a. Small business community representative b. Corporate community representative (family-friendly workplace with efforts related to child care) c. To apply for all public seats, please go to the Board and Commissions.	Joyce Hasting called for a motion to approve the 5/13/2026 minutes. Ben Trentleman motioned. Holly Kingston seconded. The motion was carried unanimously and the meeting minutes were approved.

	C. Approval of 5/13/2026, Meeting Minutes	
OCC Director's Update	**<u>OCC Staff Federal Update- Heather Thomas</u>** To view this update, go to page 5 in the PowerPoint. A. Heather Thomas provided a federal update regarding the new Restoring Flexibility in the Child Care and Development Fund rule, which goes into effect on July 13. This rule does not introduce any new regulations. Instead, it rescinds several federal mandates established in 2024, returning flexibility to individual states to determine their own administrative and payment policies. Utah already implements three of the four previously mandated policies and plans to continue doing so. However, because the state is no longer federally required to implement the final policy—which would have involved funding direct child care services through grants or contracts—the department will not pursue it at this time due to current budget constraints. ***<u>Discussion</u>*** A. No Discussion **<u>Proposed Child Care Subsidy Changes - Heather Thomas</u>** PowerPoint slide 6 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. A. **Heather Thomas** introduces the proposal with the acknowledgment that navigating the multi-million dollar budget reduction has had various challenges, requiring cuts across all program areas and potentially necessitating further decisions over the next few years. With a continued commitment to transparency and feedback, the department's focus remains on prioritizing families with the highest need, exploring alternative funding sources, and coordinating with early childhood partners to connect affected families with other community resources. PowerPoint slide 7 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. B. A review of the Employment Support Child Care (ESCC) data tracking back to fiscal year 2019 reveals a significant, steady increase in participation. This long-term growth is partially attributed to policy changes implemented during the pandemic that raised income eligibility thresholds, allowing more families within the middle-income range to qualify. Despite experiencing consistent year-over-year growth and a substantial overall influx of participants, the program has continually operated without a waitlist, successfully serving all eligible applicants up to this point. PowerPoint slides 8-9 correspond with this portion of the presentation.	

	C. A review of the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) allocation alongside Employment Support Child Care (ESCC) expenditures from fiscal year 2019 to 2026 highlights a significant disparity in financial growth. The total CCDF allocation—which includes state maintenance of effort funding and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) transfers—has grown at a much slower rate than the ESCC subsidy expenditures over the same period. Because expenditure growth is vastly outpacing funding increases, visual modeling demonstrates the two metrics rapidly converging. With the subsidy program now consuming the vast majority of the division's total annual budget, this trajectory illustrates the financial unsustainability of maintaining the program at its current operational level without making structural adjustments. PowerPoint slide 10-11 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. D. An overview of the maximum subsidy rates relative to the 2024 Market Rate Study clarifies that current rates are set at the 60th percentile for early childhood care and the 50th percentile for school-age care. Practically, this means the subsidy covers the full cost of tuition at six out of ten and five out of ten local providers, respectively. Although these rates sit below the 75th percentile federal recommendation, maintaining current levels is projected to drive costs significantly higher due to anticipated annual enrollment growth and anticipated tuition inflation following the upcoming 2027 Market Rate Study. Financial forecasting demonstrates that even if subsidy rates were reduced across the board to the 50th percentile, future expenditures for this program alone would still outpace the division's entire projected budget allocation. Consequently, adjusting provider subsidy rates will not be sufficient to resolve the overarching budget deficit. PowerPoint slide 12 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. E. Data from the University of Utah's market rate study demonstrates that for child care centers, the current monthly ESCC subsidies fall well short of the actual cost of high-quality care across all age groups. For family child care providers—where a single high-quality cost structure is applied across all ages due to a shared classroom environment—a similar monthly shortfall exists. Ultimately, the data illustrates that existing maximum subsidy rates remain set well below the operational costs required to deliver high-quality care on a per-child, per-month basis. PowerPoint slide 13 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.	

	F. Enhanced Subsidy Grants help high-quality programs offset additional expenses but do not fully close the operational cost gap. Because federal Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) regulations mandate quality-based payments, the program cannot be entirely eliminated. Furthermore, projections indicate that drastically reducing current grant rates would yield minimal savings, meaning adjustments to this program alone cannot resolve the overarching budget deficit. PowerPoint slides 14-15 correspond with this portion of the presentation. G. Program participation and expenditure data confirm that the Child Care Assistance Program successfully targets families with the greatest financial need. The highest concentration of enrolled children and projected funding is directed toward Income Group 1, the lowest-income tier. Both enrollment numbers and overall spending steadily decline as income levels rise, demonstrating that the vast majority of program resources are consistently utilized by the lowest-income households. PowerPoint slide 16 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. H. Federal regulations generally require parent copays, but states are permitted to exempt specific priority populations; accordingly, families in the lowest-income tier (Income Group 1) are not assessed a copay. For the remaining tiers, copays incrementally increase to a maximum of 7% of a family's household income as they move into higher brackets. This graduated scale is intentionally designed to slowly transition participants off the assistance program by gradually increasing their financial responsibility as their earnings grow. PowerPoint slide 17 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. I. Comparative national data from the National Women's Law Center provides context for Utah's subsidy framework relative to the rest of the country. While state approaches to provider rates and income eligibility limits vary widely, Utah currently operates at the federal maximum for its initial income limit. Notably, although many states currently utilize waitlists or freeze program intake, the division has strategically avoided implementing a waitlist due to its administrative burden and ineffectiveness for families needing immediate assistance. Additionally, the state's sliding copay scale aligns seamlessly with standard national trends. PowerPoint slide 18 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. J. The guiding principles behind the proposed childcare subsidy changes prioritize focusing resources on the	

highest-need populations, specifically low-income families with children ages 0-5 requiring full-time care. To minimize the immediate impact on current participants, certain priority households will experience no changes to their rates or eligibility, while all other adjustments will be phased in gradually at each family's scheduled annual review. Furthermore, the framework utilizes distinct entry and exit income thresholds to support sustainable wage growth, preventing families from abruptly losing assistance as their earnings increase. Finally, long-term fiscal stability is built into the model through multi-year planning that accounts for both anticipated provider rate increases and projected enrollment growth within the remaining eligible tiers.

PowerPoint slide 19 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

K. The first proposed policy adjustment focuses on lowering the income eligibility limits for both program entry and exit. Because participants retain 12-month continuous eligibility, families whose income exceeds the new exit limit during their participation year will not lose assistance until their scheduled annual review, provided their earnings do not surpass the absolute maximum federal cap. Despite these reductions, the proposed eligibility thresholds will still remain higher than those required for other standard public assistance programs, such as Medicaid, SNAP, and TANF.

PowerPoint slide 20 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

L. An analysis of the proposed income eligibility limits indicates a targeted reduction in overall caseloads. It is predicted that less than 11% of currently enrolled families will lose assistance during their next annual review cycle by exceeding the newly lowered exit threshold. Furthermore, tightening initial program entry limits will notably reduce new applicant volume, as historical data demonstrates that many recent applicants would not have qualified under the new restrictions. Despite this expected decrease in the broader applicant pool, overall program enrollment is still projected to continue growing within the lower-income groups that remain eligible for assistance.

PowerPoint slide 21 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

M. The second proposed policy adjustment modifies the calculation method for part-time subsidy rates. Under the current system, families are categorized into tiers based on their documented child care needs during approved work or training hours. By shifting the baseline hourly calculation formula for Tiers 1 through 3, this adjustment is designed to ensure that part-time reimbursement rates more accurately reflect the true percentage of full-time care being utilized.

PowerPoint slide 22 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

N. The anticipated impact of this structural adjustment is that while full-time subsidy rates will remain unchanged, monthly subsidies will decrease for approximately one-third of participating children—those currently classified in Tiers 1 through 3. Consequently, the average subsidy payments issued for part-time care will decrease, which may result in higher out-of-pocket expenses for families depending on their provider's individual rates.

PowerPoint slide 23 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

O. The next proposed policy adjustment modifies the participation tiers for school-age children. Because federal funds cannot be utilized to cover care during regular school hours, this proposal caps school-age subsidy participation at Tier 2 during the academic year. Currently, school-age children are often assigned the same tier as their younger siblings, which inadvertently authorizes full-time billing regardless of the older child's school attendance. Exceptions to the Tier 2 cap will be granted based on documented family need, such as during summer months, extended school breaks, or for parents working non-traditional shifts. To offset the impact of capping these hours, the proposal simultaneously increases the base subsidy rates for school-age children to the 60th percentile to match the higher market-rate percentiles established for all other age groups.

PowerPoint slide 24 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

P. Capping school-age tiers during the academic year will decrease average monthly subsidy payments for part-time care, potentially increasing out-of-pocket expenses for affected families and requiring providers with fixed annual rate structures to adapt. Conversely, average summer subsidy payments are projected to increase due to the alignment with higher market-rate percentiles.

PowerPoint slide 25-26 corresponds with this portion of the presentation.

Q. The presentation also reviewed two policy implementations already in progress, noting that state payments for registration fees will be limited to one per child within a 12-month period, with exceptions reserved strictly for child endangerment or program expulsion. Additionally, beginning in August 2026, a new job search allowance will grant individuals a maximum of three months of continuous assistance to

	secure new employment following a job loss before their case closes, though families retain the right to reapply once eligible. The division reiterated that the proposed framework is designed to build multi-year fiscal stability while completely insulating the highest-need populations. Under this model, low-income families requiring full-time care for young children will experience no reductions, policy updates will be phased in gradually at scheduled annual reviews to minimize structural shock, and staggered entry and exit limits will ensure families can pursue sustainable wage growth without immediately losing assistance. PowerPoint slide 25-26 corresponds with this portion of the presentation. R. Financial projections indicate that the combined proposed changes will yield an average annual budget decrease of approximately $15.6 million over a three-year phase-in period. This multi-year model specifically accounts for continued year-over-year enrollment growth within the remaining eligible income groups, alongside anticipated subsidy rate increases to address inflation and align with upcoming market rate studies. Because the policy adjustments interact with one another, the fiscal impacts are distributed proportionally across the initiatives: the reduction in income eligibility limits drives the vast majority of the projected savings, followed by the modifications to school-age tiers and part-time subsidy rates, with the updates to registration fees and job search allowances accounting for a minimal fraction of the overall budgetary decrease. ***Discussion*** A. Jennifer Stout asked if a link to the presentation slides wo shared. a. Heather Thomas confirmed that the presentation will be posted on the public meeting notice website. She also noted that Jennifer could email her directly to receive the link. B. Joyce Hasting suggested clarifying the specific dates of the state's fiscal year for the benefit of the attendees and providers. a. Heather Thomas explained that the fiscal year (FY) runs from July 1 through June 30. To help illustrate this timeline, she noted that FY26 spanned from July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2026, meaning the state is currently operating in FY27.	

	C. Holly Kingston requested clarification on the proposed eligibility tiers, specifically asking to verify if the new limit for first-time applicants aligns with Income Group 6, and if the recertification limit aligns with Income Group 10. a. Heather Thomas confirmed this understanding, clarifying that those specific income groups serve as the practical equivalents to the proposed State Median Income (SMI) percentage limits. D. Missy requested clarification on whether the projected $15.6 million in savings included the previously discussed reductions to the Enhanced Subsidy Grant, noting that a decrease in high-quality payments was not listed in the percentage breakdown on the slide. a. Heather Thomas clarified that the grant reductions are calculated separately. She explained that previously discussed changes to the Enhanced Subsidy Grant—such as eliminating the High Quality Plus rating and capping the grant at a program's licensed capacity—reduce costs on their own. The $15.6 million figure specifically represents the anticipated savings strictly from the new subsidy changes presented today (income limits, part-time rates, and school-age tiers). b. Cristina Barrera asked how this current proposal aligns with the broader CCDF budget adjustment proposal that the department shared back in April. c. Heather Thomas explained that the April presentation covered cuts made across other division programs. A subsequent meeting in May established a potential target amount for subsidy reductions. Today's presentation specifically outlines the mechanics of how the division plans to achieve those targeted subsidy reductions. E. Missy inquired about the proposal's official status, implementation timeline, and the availability of public income eligibility charts for families. a. Heather Thomas confirmed the proposal is being presented for committee feedback. Potential implementation is targeted for Fall 2026, pending IT updates. While public charts have not been created yet, the division is committed to proactively communicating any finalized limits to ensure families and providers have ample time to prepare.	

F. Missy cautioned that capping school-age care at part-time (Tier 2) rates during the academic year will financially strain providers and create significant administrative complexities. She emphasized that childcare spots operate as a commodity; providers incur high fixed costs for specialized transportation, vehicle insurance, and split-shift staffing regardless of the hours a child spends at school. Furthermore, accommodating varying school district calendars, charter school breaks, and early dismissals adds immediate staffing and food costs.
   a. Heather Thomas stated that under the proposed system, it would be the parent's responsibility to notify the state to temporarily increase their authorized tier during school breaks or schedule changes.
   b. Missy warned that relying on parents to report schedule variations often fails, which will inevitably lead to provider revenue shortfalls and friction with families.
   c. Heather Thomas acknowledged that managing this notification process will be an ongoing challenge.

G. Online participants Allison May and Jennifer Stout requested clarification on the specific implementation timeline, asking which month "Fall 2026" represents.
   a. Heather Thomas explained that program updates are typically implemented around October 1st to align with annual adjustments to the State Median Income (SMI) and the start of the federal fiscal year. While she noted October 1st as the general target, she stated she could not commit to an exact date since the changes remain a proposal, but said she would communicate final dates as soon as they are established.

H. Kristen Schulz, supported by online attendee Jennifer Stout, requested that the committee consider pursuing state funding to fill the federal budget gap rather than relying strictly on program cuts. Additionally, Kristen also asked for comparative data on other states that utilize state revenue to fund their childcare subsidies, and whether any of those funding models could be implemented in Utah.
   a. Heather Thomas acknowledged that many states use state dollars to supplement federal funds and committed to reaching out to national advocacy agencies to gather that data for the committee.

I. Monica Gailey and Johnny Anderson expanded on the operational concerns regarding the proposed part-time cap for school-age children, emphasizing the administrative burden and potential safety risks to children.
   a. Monica Gailey noted that school-age care involves significant hours (early mornings, early dismissals, full days during school breaks) and high overhead costs for transportation and split-shift labor. She expressed concern that capping subsidies will leave families unable to afford the difference, potentially resulting in children walking home alone or being left in unsafe situations. She further stressed that tracking the varying schedules of multiple public and charter schools will create an administrative nightmare for providers, potentially requiring them to hire additional staff just to manage the scheduling and billing changes.
   b. Heather Thomas reiterated that the part-time tier is meant to be a default baseline, and that parents can provide documentation to request a higher tier exception if their work schedule necessitates more care hours.
   c. Johnny Anderson stated that providers would generally prefer a straightforward, across-the-board rate cut rather than implementing structural changes that drastically increase the administrative complexity for both providers and the state.

J. Missy suggested that the state and local school districts should assist with school-age transportation logistics rather than placing the entire financial and physical burden on childcare providers. She further explained the difficulties of managing multiple daily school runs in heavy traffic and noted that current district policies often prohibit children from being bused to a childcare program instead of their home address, even if the program is within the school's busing boundary.
   a. Joyce Hasting shared that she had past success negotiating directly with a local district to establish a bus stop at her facility, encouraging providers to attempt local outreach.
   b. Brian Zabriskie noted in the online chat that his facility has not had success negotiating with local school districts.

K. Jennifer Floyd requested clarification on the total budget reduction amount, noting that the proposed $15.6 million in subsidy cuts combined with previously

	discussed program cuts still falls short of the division's overall $21 million reduction goal. She further pointed out that even if the committee successfully petitions the legislature for state funding, those funds would not be available in time to cover the budget shortfall for the current fiscal year. a. Heather Thomas confirmed that total identified cuts currently sit at approximately $18.9 million. She acknowledged the remaining gap but explained that the division will utilize reserve funding and one-time TANF funds to bridge the immediate shortfall for this year while they continue to evaluate further programmatic changes for the future. L. Holly Kingston requested operational clarification on two transition points, asking first if providers could use Groups 6 and 10 on the current 2025 chart as a rough estimate for the new income eligibility limits. Second, she asked how the new part-time rate reductions would affect families mid-certification, specifically questioning if a family recertifying in August would see an immediate rate drop when the new rules take effect in October. a. Heather Thomas confirmed that current Groups 6 and 10 provide a close baseline, noting that while Group 10 already aligns exactly with 65% SMI, Group 6 will be slightly adjusted to hit the precise 50% SMI benchmark for 2026. Regarding rate changes, she clarified that federal regulations prohibit decreasing rates during a family's 12-month eligibility period. Therefore, any reductions will only be applied at a family's next scheduled annual review, meaning the adjustments will phase in gradually over a full year. M. Holly Kingston requested clarification on two transition points, asking first if providers could use Groups 6 and 10 on the current 2025 chart as a rough estimate for the new income eligibility limits. a. Heather Thomas confirmed that current Groups 6 and 10 provide a close baseline, noting that while Group 10 already aligns exactly with 65% SMI, Group 6 will be slightly adjusted to hit the precise 50% SMI benchmark for 2026. N. Holly Kingston then asked how the new part-time rate reductions would affect families mid-certification, specifically questioning if a family recertifying in August would see an immediate rate drop when the new rules take effect in October.	

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>
a. Heather Thomas clarified that federal regulations prohibit decreasing rates during a family's 12-month eligibility period. Therefore, any reductions will only be applied at a family's next scheduled annual review, meaning the adjustments will phase in gradually over a full year.

O. Both Holly Kingston and Joyce Hasting expressed their appreciation to Heather Thomas and the division for the extensive data and hard work that went into developing the proposal. They acknowledged the difficult nature of the budget cuts, with Joyce noting that the thorough background information provided valuable context for understanding the division's approach.
a. Heather Thomas thanked the committee for their feedback, specifically highlighting the strong concerns raised regarding the administrative complexities of the school-age part-time tier. She committed to reevaluating the school-age proposal and exploring how its implementation might be adjusted to alleviate the anticipated burden on providers.
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Partner Highlight</td><td>
To view this update, go to pages 29-32 in the PowerPoint.
<u>Child Care Resource Agency Northern - Janet Johnston</u>

<u>Discussion</u>
A. No Discussion
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>CCQS</td><td>
To view this update, go to pages 34-36 in the PowerPoint.
<u>- JoEllen Robins</u>
A. JoEllen reviewed current CCQS data.
B. Peer learning communities will be reopening for childcare centers. The programs will operate on a three-cycle structure, which will guide participants through three distinct learning focuses and their associated coursework.
C. The new CCQS framework launch was successful, and 26 childcare programs have already been scored under the updated system.

<u>Discussion</u>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

	A. No Discussion	
Engagement & Development	To view this update, go to pages 38-41 in the PowerPoint. **- Jamie Foster** A. Jamie Foster provided an overview of the recent Early Childhood Professionals Survey, which gathered 262 responses primarily from program owners, licensees, and lead teachers. a. Primary professional development goal among respondents is improving program quality, and when seeking training, providers strongly prefer online, asynchronous courses offered during weeknights or school breaks. While low compensation and managing children's behaviors remain the top challenges in the field, the data revealed an encouraging 93% of respondents plan to stay in the early childhood profession for at least another 5 to 10 years. b. The division will distribute these findings to regional Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) agencies to help align future training schedules with provider preferences and to better advertise underutilized support programs. ***Discussion*** A. No Discussion	
Grants Update	To view this update, go to pages 43-44 in the PowerPoint. **-Emma Moench** A. Emma provided an update regarding the Teen After School Prevention (TAP) Grant, which is funded through TANF. She explained that programs operating under TANF Purposes 3 and 4 will now be subject to stricter eligibility regulations and verification requirements regarding citizenship and legal residency status than in previous years. ***Discussion*** A. No discussion	
Subsidy Update	To view this update, go to pages 46-48 in the PowerPoint. **-Camie Galt** A. Camie introduced the new "Attendance Verification" tab within the Provider Portal that will go live on August 1st. One feature she noted is that when attendance uploads are required, automated email notifications will be sent to all designated financial and facility administrators. To ensure privacy and data security, these notification emails will strictly serve as a prompt to log in and will not contain any children's names or identifying information. B. Camie provided a brief overview of three proposed policy changes regarding subsidy benefits, aimed at strengthening program integrity and clarifying payment	

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rules. These updates include a new requirement for families to report absent or non-custodial parents on their applications, updated overpayment procedures to prevent dual issuances when a family changes facilities, and a strict 25-mile relocation threshold for a family to qualify for a second provider payment in the middle of a month.

<u>Discussion</u>
A. Missy Sparks requested clarification regarding the 25-mile relocation rule, specifically asking if the second payment issued to the new provider would be a prorated amount.
    a. Camie confirmed that the second payment would indeed be prorated, up to the maximum amount the family is eligible to receive.
B. Holly Kingston inquired about the implementation timeline for the proposed requirement regarding non-custodial parent information.
    a. Camie clarified that the policy is currently still in the proposal stage and an official timeline will be shared once finalized.
    b. Heather Thomas added further context, explaining that this change will not create a new section on the overall myCase application. Instead, it will simply make an existing section—which is already required for other state programs—mandatory for families applying solely for childcare benefits
C. Jennifer Stout requested clarification on whether this reporting requirement still applies if the father is not listed on the child's birth certificate.
    a. Camie confirmed that the applicant is still required to report the father's identity in these instances, unless they qualify for the Good Cause exemption process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Updates</td>
<td>To view this update, go to pages 51-57 in the PowerPoint.
<u>Licensing - Krystal Knippers</u>

<u>Discussion</u>
A. No discussion

<u>USBE- Cristina Barrera</u>

<u>Discussion</u>
A. No discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Other Business	**<u>Katie Ricord - Public Service Announcement</u>** A. Katie Ricord announced the 52nd Utah Early Childhood Conference on March 12 & 13th at Weber State University. ***<u>Discussion</u>*** A. No discussion	
Adjournment	**<u>Upcoming Meeting:</u>** Wednesday, September 9, 2026 ~ 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm	Joyce Hasting called for a motion to adjourn. Rhonda Dosset motioned. Holly Kingston seconded. The motion was carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned.