



**Michigan Department of Lifelong Education, Advancement, and Potential**

**Office of Child Development and Care**

**5/13/2026**

**Request for Proposal**

**TITLE: Child Care Development Fund Market Rate Survey (MRS)**

**NATURE OF ACTION REQUESTED: Voluntary**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>SECTION I: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION II: GRANT PURPOSE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SECTION III: GRANT DETAILS</b>	<b>15</b>
MiLEAP STRATEGIC GOALS	15
TARGET POPULATION TO BE SERVED	15
ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS TO ADMINISTER THE FUND	15
STATUTE	15
GRANT PERIOD AND FUNDING LIMIT	15
STATEMENT OF WORK	15
<b>PAYMENT SCHEDULE</b>	<b>15</b>
FINANCIAL REPORTING	16
PROGRESS REPORTING	16
PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN	16
<b>SECTION IV: ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS</b>	<b>17</b>
PROCUREMENT	17
SUBGRANTEE	17
PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT	18
CONFLICTS AND ETHICS	18
ASSIGNMENT AND DELEGATION	19
INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS	19
LIABILITY	20
INDEMNIFICATION	20



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

RECORD MAINTENANCE, INSPECTION, EXAMINATION, AND AUDIT	20
CONFIDENTIALITY	21
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	21
REGULATION COMPLIANCE	21
GOVERNING LAW	22
COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS	22
NON-DISCRIMINATION CLAUSE	22
ANTI-LOBBYING	22
<b>IRAN SANCTIONS ACT</b>	<b>23</b>
UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES	23
PREVAILING WAGE ACT STATUTORY PROVISION	23
DISCLOSURE OF LITIGATION OR OTHER PROCEEDING	23
MEDIA RELEASES	24
WEBSITE INCORPORATION	24
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION	24
CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT	24
<b>SECTION V: APPLICATION PROCESS</b>	<b>24</b>
PRE-PROPOSAL WEBINAR	24
APPLICATION SUBMISSION	25
REVIEW PROCESS	25
REVIEW CRITERIA	25
Narrative Proposal	26
Quality of Personnel	28
Budget Summary	29
GRANT APPLICATION REVIEWERS	29
REJECTION OF PROPOSALS	29
<b>SECTION VI: APPLICATION FORMS</b>	<b>30</b>
NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY (Form A)	30
APPLICATION COVER PAGE (Form B)	30
ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS (Form C)	30
NARRATIVE PROPOSAL (Form D)	30
QUALITY OF PERSONNEL (Form E)	31
BUDGET SUMMARY (Form F)	31

## SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

The Michigan Department of Lifelong Education, Advancement and Potential (MiLEAP) is seeking a partner to complete a Market Rate Survey (MRS) or cost-based estimation evaluation (alternative methodology) of child care scholarship payment rates, as part of the Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) program requirements. The evaluation will be used to certify that Michigan's payment rates are sufficient to ensure equal access for eligible children that are comparable to child care services provided to children whose parents are not eligible for CCDF.

This grant opportunity is funded by state general fund. The grant will be awarded through a competitive application process. The maximum amount available to fund this grant is up to \$350,000.00.

Information for this grant opportunity including the necessary forms and instructions for completing the application, are available online at [www.michigan.gov/childcare](http://www.michigan.gov/childcare).

Applications must be received at the MiLEAP by **12:00pm EST on 6/10/2026** in PDF format with all pages attached in a single email to [MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov](mailto:MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov).

Questions regarding this grant announcement must be directed via email to [MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov](mailto:MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov).

## SECTION II: GRANT PURPOSE

For the purposes of this RFP, the following definitions will apply to these terms throughout this document:

- Market Rate Survey – a survey used to analyze prices and fees charged by child care providers. It collects data on components such as tuition rates, age groups, and operating costs.
- Cost Estimation Model – a dynamic tool used to calculate the true cost of delivering high-quality early childhood education, accounting for staff wages, benefits, facility costs, and operational expenses.
- Narrow Cost Analysis – a study used to determine the actual costs of providing child care at different quality levels. It compares these costs against current scholarship payment rates (using a base level and higher, tiered levels) to identify funding gaps.

Section 658E(c)(4) of the Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) Act, 42 U.S.C. § 9858c(c)(4)(A), requires Lead Agencies to certify that their payment rates are sufficient to ensure equal access for eligible children that are comparable to child care services provided to children whose parents are not eligible for CCDF and provide a summary of the facts used to determine that their payment rates are sufficient to ensure equal access (see also 45 CFR 98.45). CCDF gives lead Agencies the flexibility to set child care payment rates based on a market rate survey or an "alternative methodology, such as a cost estimation model" (42 U.S.C. 9858c(c)(4)(B)(i); see also 45 CFR 98.45(c)(2)). Basing payment rates on the cost of care, rather than using a price-based market rate survey, can better capture child care operational costs because child care prices (i.e., market rates) are constrained by what families can afford to pay, particularly

in lower-income communities. Therefore, rates based on cost can increase parent choice in child care arrangements, improve access to high-quality care that meets family needs, improve provider operational stability, increase child care quality, and better support workforce compensation, recruitment, and retention.

MiLEAP is interested in this study including a variety of approaches to gather the necessary information, including, but not limited to: a market rate survey, alternate methodologies (such as a cost estimation model), and utilization of available administrative data to meet the requirements. In addition, a narrow cost analysis must be done regardless of approach.

The applicant can propose one of the following approaches:

1. Market Rate Survey and Narrow Cost Analysis
  - a. Note: If this approach is proposed, the applicant should include a recommendation for how alternative methodology could be utilized in the future
2. Cost Estimation Model (Alternative Methodology) and Narrow Cost Analysis

In the proposal the applicant shall describe why they recommend using this approach, and the timeline for completion that includes a finalized report by May 1, 2027. Of note: alternative methodologies must be approved by the Office of Child Care and this approval can take up to a minimum of 60 days.

If the applicant is proposing a **market rate survey**, the following must be included:

- A. The Grantee will conduct a minimum of three information sessions (via webinar) to inform partners and providers (including tribal partners) of the intent of the project, how the MRS and narrow cost analysis will be conducted, what to expect, and how they can participate. In addition, the Grantee will share with providers how the information collected during the survey is used to propose rate increases for childcare providers in Michigan. The Grantee will be responsible for answering all questions from the public related to the study during these sessions.
- B. Prior to conducting surveys, the Grantee will present to MiLEAP the pros and cons of utilizing a common survey across licensed provider types vs. utilizing customized surveys specific to licensed provider types. The final format of the MRS proposed to MiLEAP for approval should take into account the following:
  - 1) At a minimum, the response rate shall be no less than 65% of licensed providers and be a representative sample of providers across the state. Prior to conducting the surveys, the Grantee will identify how the required participation rate will be achieved and how the Grantee will monitor progress toward meeting the 65% target.
  - 2) Responses will be collected through a variety of mechanisms, including, but not limited to existing administrative data, online surveys, Quick Response Codes (QR), paper surveys and utilization of phone surveys.
    - Grantee will be responsible for collecting and cleaning the data received from the surveys and administrative data. MiLEAP will assist the Grantee in accessing data that currently exists from

- childcare licensing, Great Start to Quality (GSQ), Family Child Care Networks (FCCNs) and the Department of Health and Human Services (Bridges).
- Response rates shall be tracked for: number completed by provider type, number partially completed by provider type, number of providers (by type) that were unable to be contacted, number of providers (by type) who refused to participate, and number who are no longer providing care.
- C. The Grantee will conduct a MRS of licensed childcare providers to determine the local child care market price (price providers charge private pay clients) based on the type of care, county, quality level rating, and age of the child.
- a. Programs to be included in the survey are: licensed childcare centers and family homes (includes Great Start Readiness Program (GSRP) programs and Head Start programs, Strong Beginnings, sectarian providers, and tribal providers).
  - b. At a minimum, the survey shall include data for:
    - i. Full time rates for infants/toddlers, preschoolers, and school age children.
    - ii. Weeks in operation during the year.
    - iii. Licensed capacity, current enrollment, and waiting lists
    - iv. Impact of workforce on ability to operate at full capacity vs shortened hours and fewer classrooms
    - v. Number of vacant slots for children (by age) and average length of time on a wait list
    - vi. Nontraditional hour care (i.e., evening care, overnight care and weekend care)
    - vii. Number of full-time staff and part-time staff to meet licensing requirements for operations requirements
    - viii. Care for a child with a disability (special needs). The Department would like data on costs associated with this type of care and the number of children in their program that has a need meeting the following definition: a child with a disability means:
      - (1) A child with a disability, as defined in section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ([20 U.S.C. 1401](#));
      - (2) A child who is eligible for early intervention services under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ([20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.](#));
      - (3) A child who is less than 13 years of age and who is eligible for services under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ([29 U.S.C. 794](#)); and
      - (4) A child with a disability, as defined by the State, Territory or Tribe involved.
    - ix. Absence hours (whether families are charged for absence hours, which includes holidays, closures, sick days, etc. as well as days the provider is available to provide care, but the child does not attend).

- x. Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) participation.
- xi. Great Start to Quality (GSQ) participation/quality level.
- xii. Acceptance of child care scholarship children.
- xiii. All types of care should include options to indicate costs for full-time and part-time care either as a weekly rate, daily rate, or hourly rate.
- xiv. Registration fees or other types of fees collected from families, including frequency of fees.
- xv. Scholarship data that includes all of the following:
  - If providers charge families additional amounts above the required co-payment that is deducted before scholarship payments are made to providers (including data on the size and frequency of such amounts).
  - Barriers providers have to participating in the scholarship program.
- xvi. The Grantee will ask child care providers what decision points they consider when deciding whether to accept the CDC scholarship or not and what policy changes would increase the likelihood of them caring for scholarship children.

## **Narrow Cost Analysis**

The applicant must analyze the estimated cost of care via a narrow cost analysis (including any variation by geographic location, category of provider, or age of child), in two areas:

- Cost of child care providers' implementation of health and safety standards, quality standards, and staffing requirements (i.e., applicable licensing and regulatory requirements, health and safety standards, training and professional development standards, and appropriate child to staff ratio, group size limits, and caregiver qualification requirements as required in 45 CFR 98.45 (b)(3), (f)(1)(ii)(A), and (f)(2)(ii)).
- The cost of higher quality care, as defined by the Lead Agency using a quality rating and improvement system or other system of quality indicators, at each level of quality as required in 45 CFR 98.45 (b)(4), (f)(1)(ii)(B), and (f)(2)(iii).

## **Alternative Methodology**

When proposing how an alternate methodology/cost estimation model approach could be completed, the following should be considered in the development:

1. Overall approach and rationale for using proposed methodology;
2. Stakeholder engagement;
3. Description of the data and expected assumptions included in the methodology and a description of the strategy for validating the model's assumptions;



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

4. Description of how the methodology will capture the universe of providers, and reflect variations by provider type, age of children, geographic location, and quality; and
5. A recommendation for how MiLEAP will set payment rates based on the results of the identified model.

### **Element 1. Overall approach and rationale for using proposed methodology**

In the final report provided to MiLEAP at the conclusion of the project, the grantee must include their evaluation outlining the reason for pursuing a cost-based approach to payment rate setting and the intended impact on the child care landscape in Michigan, including any short- and long-term goals for updating payment rates based on cost. If applicable, the description should include any intention for a phased-in approach to incrementally increase rates based on the cost of care over time.

The following should be included in Element 1:

- How the cost-based alternative methodology will contribute to supporting and increasing parental choice, equal access, and quality in the child care landscape
- How the cost-based methodology was developed, including any experts or partners who helped design the process (e.g., conduct data collection or validation) and/or build the cost-estimation model
- Description of the program models, populations, and geographies that will be analyzed as part of the cost-based methodology

### **Element 2: Stakeholder engagement**

Stakeholders must be consulted, including State Early Childhood Education and Care Advisory Council or similar coordinating body, local child care program administrators, local child care resource and referral agencies, and organizations representing child care caregivers, teachers, and directors, before conducting an alternative methodology (45 CFR 98.45(e)). Continuous stakeholder engagement is important when developing valid and reliable cost estimation models and conducting the analysis for a cost-based methodology.

The following should be included in Element 2:

- How the Grantee plans to structure and conduct engagement of interested parties and partners, including who will be engaged and what strategies will be used (State Early Childhood Education and Care Advisory Council, local child care program administrators, local child care resource and referral agencies, Family Child Care Networks, Regional Child Care Coalitions, parents and family members representing those participating in the child care scholarship program, organizations representing child care caregivers, teachers, and directors, etc.).
- How the Grantee will ensure engagement is meaningful and input informs the development of the cost-based alternative methodology and validation of cost components included in the cost-estimation model (i.e., model assumptions).
- How stakeholders will be consulted to validate model assumptions

- How stakeholders will be educated, informed, and consulted throughout the entire process

**Element 3: Description of the data and expected assumptions included in the methodology and a description of the strategy for validating the model's assumptions.**

A cost-estimation model uses a set of assumptions and data to build estimated costs associated with operating child care programs. When developing the methodology, the Grantee is encouraged to consider what data is available to them (i.e., administrative data) and use quality standards or benchmarks whenever possible, as well as consider whether to consult with experts in the field of cost modeling, fiscal analysis, and survey methodology. Data collection should be used to supplement administrative data, confirm accuracy of data, validate data with stakeholder engagement, and/or provide information not captured in existing data sources, to minimize the burden on individual providers. The Grantee should provide a description of the data and expected assumptions to be included in the methodology, including how these elements will yield valid and reliable results from the model. The data used to conduct the cost-based methodology, including the data collection, should be the most recent data available (within the previous two years) so that the results of the cost-based methodology reflect the most current costs. Grantee may use existing administrative data or collect new data to inform the assumptions in the model. If new data will be collected, the Grantee should include a description of the data collection methodology and timeframe. If certain data, including administrative data, is not updated and available within the two-year timeframe, the proposal should justify how the data element is valid.

The following should be included in Element 3:

- Data
  - How the Grantee will determine what data is already available, consider a wide range of sources, such as administrative, local, state, and national data, and determine what data collection is needed in addition to existing data.
  - If using a new data collection, describe what data will be collected and how the data collection will include all provider types and what sort of outreach will be conducted to ensure adequate response rates. Additionally include a timeline of any surveys or primary data collection activities.
  - If the Grantee proposes to use data that cannot be updated and available within the two-year timeframe, provide justification for how that data is necessary and valid.
- Assumptions
  - Salaries, health insurance, and other benefits for employees across program models
  - Staffing levels that reflect ratios, group sizes, and hours of operation at each child care setting, including paid time off and planning time for staff and caregivers



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

- Facilities and other operational costs associated with each program model (e.g., rent and utilities, materials, food)
- Description of intended data sources used to inform each assumption and cost, as well as the data collection timeframe.

**Element 4: Description of how the methodology will capture the universe of providers, and reflect variations by provider type, age of children, geographic location, and quality.**

The evaluation should describe how the proposed methodology will address the universe of providers and programs that receive CCDF funding and reflect variations by provider type, age of children, geographic location, and quality (45 CFR 98.45(b)(4) and 98.45(d)(1)). Grantee should conduct analysis for each of the variations listed below and should be informed by data and assumptions listed in Element 3. Consideration should be given to how the variations in cost estimated in the methodology and included in the assumptions will account for underserved communities and wages for the workforce. Grantee should develop multiple cost scenarios that account for differing levels of quality. As with any equal access analysis, Grantee is required to include at least one scenario that models the base level of quality that meets health, safety, and staffing requirements (45 CFR 98.45(b)(3) and 98.45(f)(2)(ii)) and one of higher quality (45 CFR 98.45(b)(4) and 98.45(f)(2)(iii)).



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

**Element 5. A recommendation for how MiLEAP will set payment rates based on the results of the identified model.**

The following should be included in the recommendation in Element 5:

- Provider/program type. The model should account for all types of programs that receive CCDF funding, including:
  - Center-based
  - Family child care
  - Licensed care
  - License-exempt care, as applicable
  - Extended/non-standard hours, as applicable
- Age of children served. The model should account for differences in the cost of care for the different ages of children served, including:
  - Infants
  - Toddlers
  - Preschoolers
  - School-age
  - Mixed age groupings, as applicable
- Geographic location. The model should account for differences in cost across different geographic locations, including:
  - population density (e.g., urban, rural)
  - geographic income distribution
  - community needs or considerations
  - Areas of extreme poverty
  - state-specific factors, such as licensing regions, community hubs, alignment with Local Education Agency areas
- Quality. The model should account for differences in cost related to quality, including:
  - wages and benefits of the workforce
  - qualifications of the workforce
  - ongoing training and professional development
  - staffing levels by ratio and group size
  - program supports & services to meet family needs, such as family engagement specialists or behavioral health specialists

Regardless of approach being proposed, the Grantee will also meet the following requirements:

- A. The Grantee will prepare a draft report to gather stakeholder feedback (30 days prior), incorporate appropriate feedback from public input, and provide a final report to MiLEAP by May 1, 2027.
  - 1) The final report must comply with CCDBG requirements (45 CFR Part 98) and with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility requirements of MiLEAP and the State of Michigan.
  - 2) The final report must include responses/feedback received by stakeholders and include key findings and recommendations to meet the CCDF State Plan requirements that are in place at the time the report is

due (see current MI CCDF State Plan as an example: [Data and Reporting](#)).

- 3) The final report must provide:
  - a. A summary of the facts relied on to determine whether rates are sufficient to ensure equal access including an analysis of whether there is equal access to childcare across the state.
  - b. A statistically valid and reliable study of the market rates for childcare services in the state that reflects variations in the cost of childcare services by geographic area, type of provider, and age of child. This should also include information on the cost of care for those providers who care for children with a disability.
  - c. An analysis of various data points that allows for an assessment of the actual cost of quality care.
  - d. Data and analysis that addresses the following questions:
    - Are there gaps between the CDC scholarship rate and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile by age group, quality level and provider type? What strategies could be used to address this?
    - What is the gap between the cost of high-quality care (enhancing quality or higher) by quality level and the amount received from the CDC scholarship? What is the difference in the amount providers are collecting from parents after accepting the CDC scholarship? What are strategies the state could use to mitigate this?
    - Do CCDF childcare providers charge tuition amounts to families that is more than the required family co-payment amount? If yes, what amounts?
    - Why do providers limit (or not accept) CDC scholarship children? What barriers exist (payment rates, practices, etc.)? How could the scholarship reimbursement process be improved to increase provider participation?
    - Should the state consider removing tiered reimbursement rates and restructuring payment rates? If yes, how so?
    - What are the recommendations for improvements in collecting this information in the future? This might include recommendations for collecting additional data, preferred data analysis and approach, including an alternative methodology, etc?
- B. The Grantee will provide all data collected, including the full analysis of the data to MiLEAP at the conclusion of the project.
- C. The Grantee will support MiLEAP in the completion of the FY27-FY29 CCDF State Plan sections specific to the MRS/alternative methodology, cost of care, and equal access. As part of this process, grantee will provide potential responses to CCDF State Plan questions.



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

- D. The Grantee will prepare a suite of resources, including an executive summary of the final report that is appropriate for sharing with decision makers for education on the cost of child care and ensuring access to high quality options for families. The goal of these resources is to:
- 1) Summarize the data that was received
  - 2) How this data is used
  - 3) How this data has been used to shape policy over the last seven years

As part of the CCDF State Plan submission, the following requirements apply to the Market Rate Survey or Alternative Methodology:

- A. Statistically Valid and Reliable Market Rate Survey. A market rate survey is an examination of prices, and Lead Agencies have flexibility to use data collection methodologies other than a survey (e.g., administrative data from resource and referral agencies or other sources) so long as the approach is statistically valid and reliable.
- B. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) is not defining statistically valid and reliable within the regulatory language but is establishing a set of benchmarks, largely based on CCDF-funded research to identify the components of a valid and reliable market rate survey. ACF will consider a market rate survey to be statistically valid and reliable if it meets the following benchmarks:
- 1) Includes the priced childcare market. The survey includes childcare providers within the priced market (i.e., providers that charge parents a price established through an arm's length transaction). In an arm's length transaction, the parent and the provider do not have a prior relationship that is likely to affect the price charged. For this reason, some unregulated, license-exempt providers, particularly providers who are relatives or friends of the child's family, are generally not considered part of the priced childcare market and therefore are not included in a market rate survey. These providers typically do not have an established price that they charge the public for services, and the amount that the provider charges is often affected by the relationship between the family and the provider. In addition, from a practical standpoint, many Lead Agencies are unable to identify a comprehensive universe of license-exempt providers because individuals frequently are not included on lists maintained by licensing agencies, resource and referral agencies, or other sources. In the absence of findings from a market rate survey, Lead Agencies often use other facts to establish payment rates for providers outside of the priced market (e.g., license-exempt providers); for example, many Lead Agencies set these payment rates as a percentage of the rates for providers in the priced market.
  - 2) Provides complete and current data. The survey uses data sources (or combinations of sources) that fully capture the universe of providers in the priced childcare market. The survey should use lists or databases from multiple sources, including child care licensing, resource and referral, Family Child Care Networks, and the scholarship program, if necessary,

for completeness. In addition, the survey should reflect up-to-date information for a specific time period (e.g., all of the prices in the survey are collected within a three-month time period).

3) Represents geographic variation. The survey includes providers from all geographic parts of the State, Territory, or Tribal service area. It also should collect and analyze data in a manner that links prices to local geographic areas.

4) Uses rigorous data collection procedures. The survey uses good data collection procedures, regardless of the method (mail, telephone, or web-based survey; administrative data). This includes a response from a high percentage of providers (generally, 65 percent or higher is desirable and below 50 percent is suspect). Some research suggests that relatively low response rates in certain circumstances may be as valid as higher response rates. Therefore, in addition to looking at the response rate, it is necessary to implement strong sample designs and conduct analyses of potential response bias to ensure that the full universe of providers in the childcare market is adequately represented in the data and findings. Lead Agencies should consider surveying in languages in addition to English based on the languages used by childcare providers, and other strategies to ensure adequate responses from key populations.

5) Analyzes data in a manner that captures market differences. The survey should examine the price per childcare slot, recognizing that all childcare facilities should not be weighted equally because some serve more children than others. This approach best reflects the experience of families who are searching for childcare. When analyzing data from a sample of providers, as opposed to the complete universe, the sample should be appropriately weighted so that the sample slots are treated proportionally to the overall sample frame. The survey should collect and analyze price data separately for each age group and category of care to reflect market differences.

MiLEAP will select one applicant that can demonstrate previous experience and the ability to develop and complete an evaluation using approved methodology that meets federal CCDBG requirements.



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

Task	Applicant Will	MiLEAP Will
Conduct a statistically valid and reliable MRS/alternative methodology that identifies CCDF scholarship rates that provide equal access.	Propose a statistically valid and reliable MRS/alternative methodology that includes all required components.	Approve proposed MRS/alternative methodology ensuring it meets all required components.
Recommend a method to assess and identify the cost of quality care (at a minimum for health and safety standards) in accordance with federal regulations.	Recommend a method to assess the cost of quality care (narrow cost analysis) in accordance with federal regulations.	Approve method to assess the cost of quality care in accordance with federal regulations.
Implement rigorous data collection procedures that meet approved participation and response rates.	Propose format and methods to ensure providers can participate in the study.  Propose data collection strategy to produce approved response rate.	Approve data collection format, methods, and strategies.
Prepare a draft report and gather stakeholder feedback (30 days prior) and incorporate appropriate feedback into a final report for MiLEAP.	Create draft final report for public comment.  Conduct public comment opportunity.  Collect comments and incorporate feedback into final report for MiLEAP approval.	Approve the draft final report for public comment.  Approve final report for submission to meet federal requirements.
Support the Department in the completion of the FY27-FY29 CCDF State Plan sections specific to the MRS/alternative methodology, cost of care, and equal access.	Propose potential responses to CCDF State Plan questions specific to the MRS/alternative methodology, cost of care, and equal access.	Submit the CCDF State Plan.



## SECTION III: GRANT DETAILS

### **MiLEAP STRATEGIC GOALS**

MiLEAP prioritizes education from birth to postsecondary with a focus on preparing children for kindergarten and helping more people earn a skill certificate or degree to help them get a good paying job. To accomplish this goal, MiLEAP will mobilize all our resources, both inside and outside the classroom, collaborate with leaders at the local, regional, and state level, and develop a plan that will put every Michigander on a path to prosperity. The Early Education division within MiLEAP strives to ensure that all young children meet their developmental milestones and enter kindergarten with the tools and ability to succeed in school. Access to high quality child care is essential to working families. MiLEAP worked with a variety of partners to implement a strong, high quality mixed delivery child care system to ensure parent access and choice throughout the state.

### **TARGET POPULATION TO BE SERVED**

Target population served includes licensed child care providers throughout the State of Michigan.

### **ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS TO ADMINISTER THE FUND**

Eligible applicants are public or private for-profit or nonprofit legal entities or agencies.

### **STATUTE**

State funding for the grant is appropriated under [Section 1101 of PA22 of 2025](#).

### **GRANT PERIOD AND FUNDING LIMIT**

The grant period is July 1, 2026 to May 31, 2027. The maximum amount available to fund this grant is up to \$350,000.00

An estimated award is not an actual award and does not constitute any binding agreement on behalf of the MiLEAP. The MiLEAP is not responsible for any costs incurred prior to the start of a final grant award period.

### **STATEMENT OF WORK**

After the grant is awarded, the applicant shall create a statement of work that proposes a timeline for all activities of the grant. This includes a detailed description of activities, a list of deliverables, and timeline for performance targets.

### **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

Payments will be made on a mutually agreeable schedule negotiated by the state and the applicant after a statement of work and budget is agreed upon. Payments under

this grant are encouraged to be processed by Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT). The applicant can register to receive payments using their SIGMA profile at the SIGMA Vendor Self Service web site. ([www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS](http://www.michigan.gov/SIGMAVSS))

## **FINANCIAL REPORTING**

Statement Of Expenditures (SOE's) are submitted on a monthly basis. Payments will be made by MiLEAP on a reimbursement basis for actual agreement expenditures incurred during the award period. The statement for the final month of this Grant must be filed no later than 15 business days after the close of that month to meet closing deadlines. Within 30 business days following MiLEAP payment of the final expenditure, or no later than 60 business days after the ending date of the grant, whichever is earlier, the grantee will submit a final financial report in the format provided by MiLEAP.

## **PROGRESS REPORTING**

The entity receiving funds to implement the program at a minimum shall report to the MiLEAP on the status of implementation on a monthly basis.

- The grantee will carry out the terms of the grant in coordination with the CDC program office.
- The grantee's lead will meet with the grant manager, via telephone, face-to-face on-site or in Lansing, for the purpose of reviewing progress and providing necessary guidance to the grantee in resolving problems which may arise.
- With the initiation of the work under the grant, the grantee will provide written program progress reports as requested by the CDC program office.
- The grantee will submit a final report at the end of the state fiscal year for review by the CDC program office.

## **PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN**

Embedded in an outcome-based accountability system, MiLEAP CDC has developed a monitoring plan that will ensure successful execution of the statement of work and will support our collective achievement of identified performance metrics. This results-based accountability framework will also help to ensure that grant resources are maximized and targeted toward the attainment and completion of identified goals and activities. The monitoring plan will be provided to the selected grantee as part of a grant agreement.

- Michigan's CCDF Monitoring Plan includes two main components: monitoring and reporting; and data and performance.
- MiLEAP CDC program office will monitor grantees utilizing the three accountability elements—project plans, progress monitoring meetings, and reporting—as key mechanisms for tracking progress and the provision of on-going support.
- As MiLEAP CDC program office is ultimately responsible for the success of each of the projects, a data-driven, performance-based infrastructure will be utilized to create accountability across projects. This component of the monitoring plan is based on the following four accountability framework elements: strategies for



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

fostering accountability; performance metrics; reporting and tracking; and performance-based agreements.

- MiLEAP CDC program office has an individualized monitoring plan and schedule that ensures MiLEAP CDC program office has regular opportunities to gauge progress, provide feedback, and engage in discussion about upcoming deliverables and performance targets. Key contact personnel will be identified within both MiLEAP CDC program office and the grantee organization to facilitate coordination of the grant. Project budgets will also be evaluated consistently with the understanding that payments will be delivered based on demonstrated progress toward delivery of agreed upon milestones and deliverables. Either MiLEAP CDC program office or the grantee may propose amendments to the monitoring plan, but both parties must agree to the proposed changes.

Performance monitoring will result in one or more of several possible outcomes:

- The monitoring will not identify any concerns; and/or
- The monitoring will identify concerns of a minor nature resulting in requirements for the grantee to modify existing project plans or expenditure processes; and/or
- The monitoring will identify substantial concerns resulting in a monitoring report and possible MiLEAP CDC response of financial penalties if satisfactory corrective action is not taken within 30 days.

## SECTION IV: ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

### **PROCUREMENT**

The Grantee agrees that all procurement transactions involving the use of state funds in excess of \$5,000 must be conducted in a manner that provides maximum open and free competition i.e. receiving multiple bids, quotes, and proposals to buy comparable goods and services. When competitive selection is not feasible or practical, the Grantee agrees to obtain the written approval of the Department before making a sole source selection. Sole source contracts should be negotiated to the extent that such negotiation is possible.

### **SUBGRANTEE**

Subgrantee means a person or entity that is awarded a portion of this Grant by Grantee and is obliged to perform that specified portion of the Grant in accordance with the Grant's terms. For any subcontracted activity or product, the Grantee will ensure:

- That a written subcontract is executed by all affected parties prior to the initiation of any new subcontract activity or delivery of any subcontracted product. Exceptions to this policy may be granted by the Department if the Grantee asks the Department in writing within 30 days of execution of the Agreement.
- That any executed subcontract to this Grant must require the subgrantee to comply with all applicable terms and conditions of this Grant. If a conflict



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

between this Grant and the provisions of the subcontract arise, the provisions of this Grant will prevail.

A conflict between this Grant and a subcontract, however, will not be deemed to exist where the subcontract:

- a) Contains additional non-conflicting provisions not set forth in this Grant;
  - b) Restates provisions of this Grant to afford the Grantee the same or substantially the same rights and privileges as the Department; or
  - c) Requires the subgrantee to perform duties and/or activities in less time than that afforded the Grantee in this Grant.
- That the subcontract does not affect the Grantee's accountability to the Department for the subcontracted activity.
  - That any billing or request for reimbursement subcontract costs is supported by a valid subcontract and adequate source documentation on costs and activities.
  - The Grantee will submit all written agreements and subcontracts funded by this Grant that are in excess of \$100,000 to MiLEAP/CDC prior to execution for review and approval.
  - That the Grantee will submit a copy of the executed subcontract less than \$100,000 if requested by the Department.
  - That the Grantee will conduct monitoring, at least annually, to ensure that the subgrantee is in compliance with the grant agreement.
  - Grantee is responsible for ensuring its subgrantees, if any, carry and maintain insurance coverage as applicable to the subcontracted service(s).

## **PURCHASE OF EQUIPMENT**

The purchase of equipment not specifically listed in the Budget must have the Department's prior written approval. Equipment means non-expendable personal property having a useful life of more than one year that costs \$10,000 or more per unit. Grantee will retain the equipment unless otherwise instructed at the time of approval.

## **CONFLICTS AND ETHICS**

No member of the legislative, judicial, or executive branch of state or federal governments or any local unit of government officials shall personally benefit from this Grant. Grantee, Grantee's parent, affiliate, or subsidiary organization, and any subgrantee that performs Grant Activities in connection with this Grant must uphold high ethical standards and are prohibited from:

- holding or acquiring an interest that would conflict with this Grant;
- doing anything that creates an appearance of impropriety with respect to the award or performance of the Grant;
- attempting to influence or appearing to influence any State employee by the direct or indirect offer of anything of value; or
- paying or agreeing to pay any person, other than employees and consultants working for Grantee, any consideration contingent upon the award of the Grant.

Grantee must immediately notify the Department of any violation or potential violation of these standards.

## **ASSIGNMENT AND DELEGATION**

The Grantee may not delegate/assign any of its obligations under this Grant without prior written approval from the State. The Grantee must notify the State at least 90 calendar days in advance of any proposed delegation and provide any information the State requires to assess whether the delegation is in its best interest.

If delegation is approved, the Grantee must:

- Remain the sole point of contact for all project-related contractual matters, including payments and charges;
- Make all payments to the subgrantee; and
- Ensure that any subgrant includes all applicable terms and conditions of this Grant.
- Give recognition to MiLEAP/CDC in any program or service contract.

The Grantee remains fully responsible for the performance of Grant activities, compliance with all terms of this Grant, and the conduct of any subgrantee. The State may, at its sole discretion, require the replacement of any subgrantee or reject any proposed consultant, Grantee, or personnel. All subcontractors must be qualified and are subject to the terms of this Grant. The Grantee is solely responsible for all subcontracted activities and will remain the primary contact for the State, including for the payment of associated charges.

The Grantee may not assign this Grant, in whole or in part, to any other party without prior approval from the State. The State may assign its rights or responsibilities under this Grant, in whole or in part, upon notice to the Grantee. If the State determines a novation is necessary, the Grantee must cooperate fully by executing the required documentation and continuing performance with the new party.

## **INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS**

The Grantee shall provide and maintain insurance coverage in an amount sufficient to protect against claims that may arise out of or result from the Grantee's operations under this Grant, or from the acts of any party for whom the Grantee is legally responsible. This includes, but is not limited to, public liability, property damage, and worker's compensation insurance, as applicable.

All required insurance or self-insurance must:

- Protect the State of Michigan and all other parties to this Grant from claims that may arise out of, are alleged to arise out of, or result from the Grantee's performance under this Grant;
- Be primary and non-contributory to any comparable liability insurance (including self-insurance) carried by the State of Michigan;

- Require that all Grantees and subcontractors maintain insurance coverage consistent with the requirements of this Section.

This section is not intended to and is not to be construed in any manner as waiving, restricting or limiting the liability of the Grantee from any obligations under this Grant.

Each party must promptly notify the other party of any knowledge regarding an occurrence which the notifying party reasonably believes may result in a claim against either party. The parties must cooperate with each other regarding such claim.

## **LIABILITY**

The Grantee, not the Department, is responsible for all liabilities because of claims, judgments, or costs arising out of activities to be carried out by the Grantee under this Grant, if the liability is caused by the Grantee, any Grantee or subgrantee, or anyone employed by the Grantee. The Department shall not be liable for any claims, judgments or costs merely by providing grant funding.

## **INDEMNIFICATION**

Inasmuch as each party to this grant is a governmental entity of the State of Michigan, each party to this grant must seek its own legal representation and bear its own costs; including judgments, in any litigation which may arise from the performance of this grant. It is specifically understood and agreed that neither party will indemnify the other party in such litigation.

## **RECORD MAINTENANCE, INSPECTION, EXAMINATION, AND AUDIT**

The Department or its designee may audit Grantee to verify compliance with this Grant. Grantee must retain, and provide to the Department or its designee, upon request, all financial and accounting records related to the Grant through the term of the Grant and for seven years after the latter of termination, expiration, or final payment under this Grant or any extension ("Audit Period"). Grantee shall also require all subgrantees/Grantees retained for the performance of this grant to retain all financial reports, supporting documents and statistical records for a period of seven or greater years after the close of the grant. If an audit, litigation, or other action involving the records is initiated before the end of the Audit Period, Grantee must retain the records until all issues are resolved.

Within 10 calendar days of providing notice, the Department and its authorized representatives or designees have the right to enter and inspect Grantee's premises or any other places where Grant Activities are being performed, and examine, copy, and audit all records related to this Grant. Grantee must cooperate and provide reasonable assistance. If any financial errors are revealed, the amount in error must be reflected as a credit or debit on subsequent invoices until the amount is paid or refunded. Any remaining balance at the end of the Grant must be paid or refunded within 45 calendar days.

This Section applies to Grantee and Grantee's parent, affiliate, or subsidiary organization and any subgrantee that performs Grant Activities in connection with this Grant.

If the Grantee is a governmental or non-profit organization and expends the minimum level specified in OMB Uniform Guidance, which is one million dollars (\$1,000,000 as of December 26, 2013) or more in total federal funds in its fiscal year, then Grantee is required to submit an Audit Report to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse (FAC) as required in 200.36.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY**

The Grantee and MiLEAP each acknowledge that the other possesses and will continue to possess confidential information that has been developed or received by it. The use or disclosure of information concerning services, applicants or recipients obtained in connection with performance of this Grant will be restricted to purposes directly connected with the administration of the programs implemented by this Grant.

## **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**

All Deliverables shall be owned by the Grantor and shall be considered works made for hire by the Grantee for the Grantor. The Grantor shall own all United States and international copyrights, trademarks, patents or other proprietary rights in the Deliverables.

With the sole exception of any preexisting licensed works, the Grantee shall assign, and upon creation of each Deliverable automatically assigns, to the Grantor, ownership of all United States and international copyrights, trademarks, patents, or other proprietary rights in each and every Deliverable, whether or not registered by the Grantee, insofar as any such Deliverable, by operation of law, may not be considered work made for hire by the Grantee for the Grantor.

From time to time upon Grantor's request, the Grantee and/or its personnel shall confirm such assignment by execution and delivery of the assignments, confirmations of assignment, or other written instruments as the State may request. The Grantor shall have the right to obtain and hold in its own name all copyright, trademark, and patent registrations and other evidence of rights that may be available for Deliverables.

## **REGULATION COMPLIANCE**

The Grantee and Grantee's contractors and subcontractors are responsible for compliance with all federal and state laws and municipal ordinances and regulations that in any manner affect the work or performance of this grant and shall at all times carefully observe and comply with all rules, ordinances and regulations.

## **GOVERNING LAW**

This Grant is governed, construed, and enforced in accordance with Michigan law, excluding choice-of-law principles, and all claims relating to or arising out of this Grant are governed by Michigan law, excluding choice-of-law principles. Any dispute arising from this Grant must be resolved in Michigan Court of Claims. Grantee waives any objections, such as lack of personal jurisdiction or an inconvenient forum (i.e., forum non conveniens). Grantee must appoint an agent in Michigan to receive service of process.

## **COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS**

Grantee must comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations.

## **NON-DISCRIMINATION CLAUSE**

In accordance with the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, 1976 PA 453, MCL 37.2101 et seq.; the Persons with Disabilities Civil Rights Act, 1976 PA 220, MCL 37.1101 et seq.; and Executive Directive 2019-09, the Grantee and its subGrantees agree not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, or any matter directly or indirectly related to employment, because of race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, height, weight, marital status, partisan considerations, any mental or physical disability unrelated to the individual's ability to perform the duties of the particular job or position, or genetic information. The Grantee further agrees that every subcontract entered into for the performance of this Grant will contain a provision requiring non-discrimination in employment, as specified above, and that such provision shall be binding upon each subGrantee. Breach of this covenant constitutes a material breach of the Grant and may be regarded as grounds for cancellation or termination.

## **ANTI-LOBBYING**

If all or a portion of this Agreement is funded with federal funds, then in accordance with 2 CFR 200, as appropriate, the Grantee shall comply with the Anti-Lobbying Act, which prohibits the use of all project funds regardless of source, to engage in lobbying the state or federal government or in litigation against the State. Further, the Grantee shall require that the language of this assurance be included in the award documents of all subawards at all tiers.

If all or a portion of this Agreement is funded with state funds, then the Grantee shall not use any of the grant funds awarded in this Agreement for the purpose of lobbying as defined in the State of Michigan's lobbying statute, MCL 4.415(2). "Lobbying" means communicating directly with an official of the executive branch of state government or an official in the legislative branch of state government for the purpose of influencing legislative or administrative action." The Grantee shall not use any of the grant funds awarded in this Agreement for the purpose of litigation against the State. Further, the

Grantee shall require that language of this assurance be included in the award documents of all subawards at all tiers.

### **IRAN SANCTIONS ACT**

Grantee certifies that it is not an Iran linked business, and that its Grantees are not Iran linked businesses, as defined in MCL 129.312.

### **UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES**

The Grantee shall abide by Act No. 278 of the Public Acts of 1980, as amended, MCL 423.321 *et seq.* Under MCL 423.324, the Department may void this Grant if the name of the Grantee or the name of a subcontractor, manufacturer, or supplier of the Grantee subsequently appears on the Unfair Labor Practice register compiled under MCL 423.322.

### **PREVAILING WAGE ACT STATUTORY PROVISION**

Grantee must comply with prevailing wage requirements to the extent applicable to this Grant. As required by MCL 408.1112, if the Michigan Prevailing Wage Act, MCL 408.1101 *et seq.*, applies to this Grant, construction mechanics (as defined in MCL 408.1101 (b)) are intended beneficiaries of the contractual prevailing wage, fringe benefit, and nondiscrimination nonretaliation requirements of the Grant. Any construction mechanic aggrieved by the failure of a Grantee or subcontractor to pay prevailing wages or benefits as specified in this Grant, or by a violation of MCL 408.1107, in addition to any other remedies provided in that Act or by law, may bring an action in a court of competent jurisdiction against the Grantee or subcontractor for damages or injunctive relief and may be awarded reinstatement or other appropriate relief, and all damages sustained, together with actual costs and attorney fees at trial and on appeal. If the Michigan Prevailing Wage Act applies to this Grant, the rates of wages and fringe benefits to be paid to each class of construction mechanic (as defined in MCL 408.1101 (b)) by the Grantee and subcontractor must not be less than the wage and fringe benefit rates prevailing in the locality in which the work is performed.

### **DISCLOSURE OF LITIGATION OR OTHER PROCEEDING**

Grantee must notify the Department within 14 calendar days of receiving notice of any litigation, investigation, arbitration, or other proceeding (collectively, "Proceeding") involving Grantee, a subgrantee, or an officer or director of Grantee or subgrantee, that arises during the term of the Grant, including:

- a) a criminal Proceeding;
- b) a parole or probation Proceeding;
- c) a Proceeding under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act;
- d) a civil Proceeding involving:

- i. a claim that might reasonably be expected to adversely affect Grantee's viability or financial stability; or
  - ii. a governmental or public entity's claim or written allegation of fraud; or
- e) a Proceeding involving any license that Grantee is required to possess in order to perform under this Grant.

## **MEDIA RELEASES**

News releases (including promotional literature and commercial advertisements) pertaining to the Grant or project to which it relates must not be made without prior written State approval, and then only in accordance with the explicit written instructions of the State. Grantee will provide the State, for its review, copies of all presentations or articles being submitted for publication at least 30 calendar days in advance.

## **WEBSITE INCORPORATION**

The Department is not bound by any content on Grantee's website unless expressly incorporated into a term of this grant.

## **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

This is a grant from public funds and records associated with it are subject to disclosure under Michigan's Freedom of Information Act.

## **CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT**

The Grantee certifies that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this Grant by any federal or State department or agency. If the Grantee is unable to certify to any portion of this statement, the Grantee must provide an explanation.

## **SECTION V: APPLICATION PROCESS**

### **PRE-PROPOSAL WEBINAR**

A pre-proposal webinar will be held on 5/20/2026 from 10:00am to 11:00am EST. The link for the webinar will be available at: [www.michigan.gov/childcare](http://www.michigan.gov/childcare).

The purpose of this webinar is to discuss general information, as well as details about the grant requirements. It will also provide an opportunity to allow potential applicants to ask questions related to the application and implementation process. CDC staff will be available to provide technical assistance as needed prior to the submission date. There is no charge for this technical assistance.



This pre-proposal webinar is for information only. CDC retains the right to make modifications to this announcement, if it is necessary, to comply with laws or ensure a clearer understanding of its content.

Questions submitted during the webinar presentation as well as questions submitted following the webinar via email will be compiled with answers and available to participants here: [www.michigan.gov/childcare](http://www.michigan.gov/childcare). Questions submitted after 5/27/2026 at 12:00pm EST will not be answered. The FAQ will be published by 12:00pm EST on 5/29/2026 to assist with proposal completion.

## **APPLICATION SUBMISSION**

Completed applications must be submitted via email to [MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov](mailto:MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov) on or before 12:00pm EST on 6/10/2026. Failure to complete submission will result in a NULL (voided) application.

Only those applicants meeting all conditions outlined will be eligible for consideration.

Questions regarding electronic application submission should be directed to the Office of Child Development and Care at [MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov](mailto:MiLEAP-CDC-ADMIN@michigan.gov).

Technical assistance regarding application submission will be addressed through 12:00pm EST on 6/8/2026. No additional assistance will be provided after the deadline.

## **REVIEW PROCESS**

The administrative completeness and eligibility of applications will be verified by staff of the MiLEAP CDC. Proposals will then be reviewed and scored by a panel of reviewers. Award selection will be based on merit and quality, as determined by points awarded for the review criteria section and all relevant information (see "Review Criteria"). Only those applications that meet all the identified criteria and are in compliance with submission requirements will be considered for funding.

The award will be subject to approval by the State Administrative Board, if applicable. All applicants will be notified in writing of the State Administrative Board's action.

## **REVIEW CRITERIA**

The following application rubric will be used as a rating instrument in the review process. **The application maximum score is 80 points.** Applicants with an application score below **64 points** will not be recommended for funding.



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

**Child Care Development Fund Market Rate Survey Grant Scoring Rubric**

<b>OVERALL POINTS AVAILABLE</b>	<b>POINTS REQUIRED FOR FUNDING RECOMMENDATION</b>
80	64

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>TOTAL POINTS AVAILABLE</b>	<b>TOTAL POINTS AWARDED</b>
<b>Narrative Proposal</b>	60	
<b>Quality of Personnel</b>	10	
<b>Budget Summary</b>	10	
<b>Overall Total Points Awarded</b>		

**Narrative Proposal**

(60 POINTS)

The applicant should include sufficient detail to demonstrate their ability to meet the grant requirements below.

1. Overall Approach, Rationale, and Timeline for Proposed Methodology
  - a. For both Market Rate Survey and Alternative Methodology proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: description of how the proposed methodology will contribute to supporting and increasing parental choice, equal access, and quality in the child care landscape; description of how the methodology was developed and any experts/partners who helped design it; description of the program models, populations, and geographies that will be analyzed as part of the approach; timeline for project milestones to meet grant objectives
2. Provider Participation and Stakeholder Engagement
  - a. For Market Rate Survey proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: plan for conducting information sessions to inform partners and providers about the survey and how to participate; identifying how the required participation rate will be achieved; how applicant will monitor progress toward the response rate; plan for tracking response rates by number/type of providers who participated/did not participate/were unable to be contacted; rationale for survey collection methods (online surveys, QR codes, phone, etc.) to support participation; plan for gathering information in languages in addition to English based on the languages used by childcare providers
  - b. For Alternative Methodology proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: structure of planned engagement of interested parties and partners; list of who will be engaged and what strategies will be used; how stakeholders will be consulted to validate

model assumptions; how stakeholders will be educated, informed, and consulted throughout the entire process

### 3. Data Analysis and Methodology

- a. For Market Rate Survey proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: identification of multiple data sources that fully capture the universe of providers in the priced childcare market; plan for ensuring data reflects current information for a specific time period; outline of rigorous data collection procedures; approach to analyze data in a manner that captures market differences (e.g. child care spaces are appropriately weighted; data is analyzed separately for each age group and category of care)
- b. For Alternative Methodology proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: list of available data (administrative data) as well as new data collection to be utilized in the study; for new data collection – a description of the data collection methodology and timeframe; description of how methodology will address universe of providers and programs; how methodology will reflect variations by provider type, age of children, geographic location, and quality level; description of how methodology will account for underserved communities and wages for the workforce

### 4. Narrow Cost Analysis

- a. For both Market Rate Survey and Alternative Methodology proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: proposed methodology for analyzing cost of quality care to meet health and safety standards, quality standards, and staffing requirements; methodology for analyzing cost of higher levels of quality care

### 5. Final Report

- a. For both Market Rate Survey and Alternative Methodology proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: plan for drafting report with compilation of all data collected and analyzed; approach for gathering public comment on draft report; plan for providing final report by May 1st deadline inclusive of responses/feedback from stakeholders, key findings, and recommendations to meet the CCDF State Plan requirements

### 6. CCDF State Plan

- a. For both Market Rate Survey and Alternative Methodology proposals, the applicant should include the following required components: how applicant will provide potential responses to CCDF State Plan questions; plan to support MiLEAP in the completion of the FY27-FY29 CCDF State Plan sections specific to the MRS/alternative methodology, cost of care, and equal access



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

For each of the responses listed in #1-6 above, the scoring rubric will be as follows:

Needs Improvement (0-4 points per response)	Adequate (5-7 points per response)	Exemplary (8-10 points per response)
The application:	The application:	The application:
includes very limited detail or missing several required components	includes somewhat detailed proposal that covers most required components but lacks sufficient clarity or explanation	includes full, detailed proposal that covers all required components above

### Quality of Personnel

(10 POINTS)

The applicant should identify individuals who will be associated with the project and its implementation. The applicant should address the qualities and qualifications of the individuals.

Needs Improvement (0-4 points)	Adequate (5-7 points)	Exemplary (8-10 points)
The application:	The application:	The application:
does not identify individuals associated with this project, designate responsibilities to specific personnel, or personnel do not have direct or closely related work experience with market rate surveys	designates most responsibilities to specific personnel and personnel are somewhat qualified to develop, administer, and implement the project; personnel have limited direct or indirect experience with market rate surveys or closely related work	designates and details all responsibilities to specific personnel and personnel are qualified to develop, administer, and implement the project; personnel have substantial direct experience with market rate surveys or closely related work

**Budget Summary**

(10 POINTS)

This section provides information to demonstrate that the project has an appropriate budget for the program and is cost-effective. The applicant must complete the budget summary and narrative form identifying expenditures that are allowable under the budget guidelines.

Needs Improvement (0-4 points)	Adequate (5-7 points)	Exemplary (8-10 points)
<p>The application: does not include budget form or includes budget form mostly incomplete, lacking significant detail, or includes expenditures unrelated to the activities proposed that are unnecessary, unreasonable, or not allowed under budget guidelines</p>	<p>The application: includes budget form that is mostly complete but lacking sufficient detail for completeness, or includes expenditures somewhat related to the activities proposed in the plan that are mostly allowable, necessary, and reasonable</p>	<p>The application: includes complete budget form with sufficient detail relating expenditures directly to the activities proposed in the plan that are allowable, necessary, and reasonable</p>

**GRANT APPLICATION REVIEWERS**

MiLEAP will designate a panel of reviewers who are knowledgeable of the Child Care Development Fund and market rate surveys. To ensure reliable scoring, the panel will be trained prior to reviewing any proposals. Persons involved in the development of a proposal or associated with an applicant or co-applicant submitting a proposal are ineligible to serve on this peer review panel.

**REJECTION OF PROPOSALS**

The MiLEAP reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received as a result of this announcement and will do so if the application does not adhere to eligibility in whole or in part or to negotiate separately with any sources whatsoever to serve the best interests of the State. Additionally, past performance on other grants, demonstrated knowledge of CCDF funding or other relevant factors will be considered when recommendations for the grant award are made to the State Administrative Board, if applicable.

## SECTION VI: APPLICATION FORMS

### **NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPLY (Form A)**

To assist the MiLEAP, CDC staff in planning for technical assistance and review of grants, your organization must submit a Notice of Intent to Apply for this grant no later than 5/22/2026 at 12:00pm EST. Submission of this form does not obligate the organization to submit an application. If an organization does not submit a Notice of Intent to Apply by this deadline, they may not submit an application for this RFP.

### **APPLICATION COVER PAGE (Form B)**

On the cover page, the organization submitting the application must be fully identified, as well as the contact person for this grant. All boxes must be appropriately completed, including signatures, addresses, telephone numbers, e-mail addresses, and the federal identification number of the applicant organization.

### **ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS (Form C)**

Assurances and Certifications must be reviewed and validated by signature of the person authorized to execute legally binding Grant Agreements with the State of Michigan.

### **NARRATIVE PROPOSAL (Form D)**

The narrative proposal should be prepared by providing a straightforward, concise description of the applicant's ability to meet the requirements of the grant. Emphasis should be on completeness and clarity of content. Relevant examples should be derived from the last ten (10) years.

The Narrative Proposal must be formatted for 8½ x 11 paper, in Verdana font no smaller than 12 font, single spaced, and margins no smaller than one-half inch. Reductions to a smaller size are not acceptable. Any footnotes may be produced in Verdana 10-point font. All pages in the Narrative Proposal must be numbered.

The Narrative Proposal section is limited to not more than 15 pages. A narrative proposal longer than 15 pages will result in extra pages removed and not reviewed.

If the applicant chooses to submit additional information to support the application, the total page count for additional documents must not exceed 2 pages. The following additional documents/pages are acceptable but not required:

- Abstract
- Table of contents

**QUALITY OF PERSONNEL (Form E)**

The information requested in this section will be used to evaluate the ability of the individuals to carry out the work of this project and meet the responsibilities identified in the Narrative Proposal. The applicant should identify individuals who will be associated with the project and its implementation, including the qualities and qualifications of the individuals. All pages must be numbered. The Quality of Personnel section is limited to not more than 5 pages, inclusive of resumes/job descriptions. Submissions beyond 5 pages for this section will result in extra pages removed and not reviewed.

**BUDGET SUMMARY (Form F)**

The information requested in this section is required to support the reasonableness of your proposal. Ensure the budget summary addresses all objectives of the proposal. The budget summary should identify anticipated expenses for the project being proposed.

A budget narrative is justification for the costs and includes the methodology used for the calculations and how the expense relates to the project or program. A budget narrative must accompany each budget category. Applicants may include no longer than two (2) pages as a budget narrative to further explain budget items provided in the budget summary spreadsheet.

**Budget Categories:**

<b>Categories</b>	<b>Description</b>
Personnel:	This category includes salaries and wages of employees of the applicant organization that will be working directly on the project.
Fringe Benefits:	Fringe benefits are allowances and services provided by employers to their employees as compensation in addition to regular salaries and wages. Fringe benefits include, but are not limited to, the costs of leave (vacation, family-related, sick or military), employee insurance, pensions, and unemployment benefit plans. Fringe costs should also include employer contributions required by law such as payroll taxes such as FICA, unemployment, and workers compensation. Fringe does not include federal income taxes, employee portion FICA, or other such costs.



Michigan Department of Lifelong  
Education, Advancement, and Potential

Categories	Description
Travel:	<p>Travel costs are expenses incurred by personnel in the performance of project activities. Itemize by person and task to make clear that the amount and nature of travel is directly linked to the accomplishment of the objectives of the project. Show travel costs and per diem separately. Provide rates and multipliers (e.g., miles, days, persons) such that reviewers can see how you arrived at the amounts proposed.</p> <p>All charges must be consistent with any established travel policies.</p>
Equipment:	<p>Equipment is defined as tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and a per-unit acquisition cost of \$10,000 or greater.</p>
Supplies:	<p>Supplies are defined as all tangible personal property other than those described in the definition of equipment. A computing device is a supply if the acquisition cost is less than \$10,000, regardless of the length of its useful life.</p>
Contractual:	<p>Include all contracts and subawards. A contract means a legal instrument for procurement of goods or services; a subaward is financial assistance provided by a pass-through entity to a subrecipient who will carry out part of the project or program under the award.</p>
Miscellaneous/Other:	<p>This category contains items not included in the previous categories, such as third-party in-kind contributions, tuition remission, rental costs, etc. Administrative costs up to 15% of the total budget may also be included for reasonable, allocable expenses for managing a grant, such as accounting, HR, legal, and other administrative tasks (reporting, monitoring, budgeting) rather than direct program delivery.</p> <p>This category must be itemized.</p>

Individuals with disabilities may contact the MiLEAP ADA Coordinator to request an alternative format to these materials. Please visit [www.Michigan.gov/ADA](http://www.Michigan.gov/ADA) for a list of state ADA Coordinators.