



The State Centralized Grants Management Model

October 2024

Introduction

In today's complex funding landscape, the implementation of a centralized grants management office (GMO) model is not just advantageous—it is essential. States are navigating an unprecedented influx of federal funds, a diversity of potentially overlapping programs and projects, and an increasing need for strategic partnerships. With heightened regulatory and stakeholder scrutiny, resource constraints, and rising administrative costs, the rationale for a centralized

approach becomes increasingly clear.. The regulatory framework established by 2 CFR 200, also known as the Uniform Guidance , has already streamlined federal grant management requirements, making the transition to a centralized model even more beneficial. Below, we delve into the specific reasons why states should consider this transition, highlighting the amplified advantages in the post-2 CFR 200 era.

Enhanced Compliance and Risk Management

Improved Efficiency and Cost Savings

The introduction of 2 CFR 200 has significantly streamlined and standardized federal grant management requirements, making it easier for states to promote compliance through a centralized system. A centralized model can better interpret and implement these regulations consistently across many departments, reducing the risk of noncompliance and associated penalties as well as prepare entities for audit. This approach is not without its challenges. Centralized oversight requires robust coordination and communication across departments, which can be resource intensive. Additionally, the transition period may expose states to temporary compliance risks as systems and processes are aligned.

Centralized grants management facilitates the establishment of unified communication channels, so that stakeholders receive consistent and timely information. This enhances collaboration and fosters stronger relationships with funders, grant recipients, and community members. A centralized approach promotes inclusive stakeholder engagement by collecting diverse perspectives for consideration in the planning and execution of grant programs, leading to more effective and impactful outcomes that align with the circumstances and priorities of stakeholders. However, maintaining effective communication across a centralized system can be challenging, particularly in large and diverse states.



40%

20 of 50 States* within the United States currently have a GMO

*The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico also has a GMO, but is not included in these totals

Enhanced Data Management and Reporting

Centralized management provides a holistic view of all grant activities, enabling better strategic planning, and resource allocation. This allows for optimal resource allocation, so that grant funding is properly directed toward the most impactful programs and initiatives. With centralized data and reporting, states can leverage data-driven insights to make informed decisions, optimize grant performance, and achieve better outcomes. Of course, the success of strategic planning and resource allocation depends on the quality of the data collected and the ability to interpret and act on it effectively.

Strengthened Capacity Building and Training

A centralized model supports the development and delivery of consistent training programs across departments, so that staff are well-versed in the Uniform Guidance and leading practices in grant management. Centralized capacity-building efforts can focus on developing specialized skills and knowledge, leading to a more competent and capable workforce that can effectively manage complex grant programs. However, the effectiveness of these training programs depends on the availability of resources and the willingness of staff to engage in continuous learning.

Improved Stakeholder Engagement and Communication

Centralized grants management facilitates the establishment of unified communication channels, so that stakeholders receive consistent and timely information. This enhances collaboration and fosters stronger relationships with funders, grant recipients, and community members. A centralized approach promotes inclusive stakeholder engagement by collecting diverse perspectives for consideration in the planning and execution of grant programs, leading to more effective and impactful outcomes that align with the circumstances and priorities of stakeholders.

Enhanced Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation

Centralized management provides a holistic view of all grant activities, enabling better strategic planning and resource allocation. This allows optimal resource allocation so that grant funding is properly directed toward the most impactful programs and initiatives. With centralized data and reporting, states can leverage data-driven insights to make informed decisions, optimize grant performance, and achieve better outcomes.

National Road Map for Implementing a Centralized Grants Management Model

Creating a centralized GMO is a complex endeavor, involving several key phases and activities. Initially, a steering committee with representatives from key departments should be established for the planning and assessment phase. A needs assessment evaluates current processes, identifies gaps, and assesses regulatory compliance. Clear objectives and scope for the centralized model are defined, followed by the development of a business case to secure executive sponsorship and funding. The design and development phase involves creating a detailed implementation plan, allocating resources, designing the system architecture, selecting technology platforms, and developing standardized processes for grant management. Drafting policies and procedures aligned with regulatory requirements and engaging stakeholders to gather feedback and refine the design are also critical steps.

Implementation begins with piloting the centralized system in select departments to test processes and address challenges, followed by a gradual rollout to additional departments with training and support for staff. Monitoring progress; making necessary adjustments; and migrating existing grant data, while maintaining data integrity and security are essential. Training and capacity programs focused on the Uniform Guidance, centralized processes, and technology tools are developed and delivered, with ongoing support and capacity building to promote continuous learning.

Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms track compliance, performance, and outcomes, with regular reviews and updates to policies and procedures. The effectiveness of the centralized model is evaluated, and feedback is gathered to foster continuous improvement. Long-term sustainability and scaling strategies are developed, securing ongoing funding and resources, and exploring opportunities to expand the model. Collaboration and knowledge sharing among departments and stakeholders are promoted to maximize the impact of grant programs.



Conclusion

Transitioning to a centralized grants management model offers states a strategic opportunity to navigate the complexities of federal funding more effectively. While the introduction of 2 CFR 200 has streamlined many aspects of grant management, the centralized approach brings its own set of challenges and trade-offs. However, by thoughtfully planning and executing this transition using a road map like the one provided above, states can significantly enhance

compliance, audit readiness, efficiency, data management, capacity building, and stakeholder engagement. This model not only optimizes the use of resources, but also strengthens the impact of grant programs, ultimately benefiting the state and its communities. The journey to centralization requires careful consideration and continuous improvement, but the potential rewards make it a worthwhile endeavor.

Get in touch



Linus Akanoh, Jr.
Advisory Principal
Deloitte & Touche LLP
lakanoh@deloitte.com



Damon Armini
Advisory Managing Director
Deloitte & Touche LLP
darmeni@deloitte.com



Joseph Simon
Advisory Manager
Deloitte & Touche LLP
jossimon@deloitte.com



Joe Gorsuch
Advisory Senior Consultant
Deloitte & Touche LLP
jgorsuch@deloitte.com

Deloitte.

This article contains general information only and Deloitte is not, by means of this article, rendering accounting, business, financial, investment, legal, tax, or other professional advice or services. This article is not a substitute for such professional advice or services, nor should it be used as a basis for any decision or action that may affect your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your business, you should consult a qualified professional adviser. Deloitte shall not be responsible for any loss sustained by any person who relies on this article.

As used in this document, "Deloitte" means Deloitte & Touche LLP, a subsidiary of Deloitte LLP. Please see www.deloitte.com/us/about for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte LLP and its subsidiaries. Certain services may not be available to attest clients under the rules and regulations of public accounting.

Copyright © 2024 Deloitte Development LLC. All rights reserved.

Designed by CoRe Creative Services. RITM19111583