



**MEP • MANUFACTURING
EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP®**

Any Manufacturing Extension Partnership

Center Performance and Profile Report (CPPR)

Panel Review Date: August 18, 2021

100 BUREAU DRIVE M/S 4800 GAITHERSBURG, MD
20899 www.nist.gov/mep | PHONE: (301) 975 - 5020

NIST National Institute of
Standards and Technology
U.S. Department of Commerce

Table of Contents

I. Center Profile	4
II. Performance Measurement and Management	6
III. Market Understanding	14
IV. Business Model and Management	27
V. Financial Viability	36
VI. National Network Citizen	40
Appendix 1	42

I. Center Profile

This section provides an overview of the Center's organizational framework. It identifies the Center type, structure, funding streams, sub-recipients and key partners.

This information will assist the reader in understanding the framework and how this ties into the Center's market understanding, business model and financial portfolio.

a. Center Type and Federal Funding Streams

Organization Type: University

Eligible Annual Federal Funding: \$775,000.00 (Previous Award Amount:)

Center (Any Manufacturing Extension Partnership) receives roughly \$608 per SME compared to the national average of \$391 per SME

Center Funding Streams: The table provided below is an overview of the NIST MEP Cooperative Agreements the Center has managed over the previous two years and current year.

Funding Source	Award Name	Start Date to End Date	Total Federal Funding	Total Non-Federal Funding
Center Operations*	MEP System	2019-01 to 2023-12	\$3,775,000.00	\$2,379,113.00
Coronavirus Aide Relief and Economic Security (CARES)	NEAP	2020-06 to 2021-09	\$300,000.00	\$0.00

* Indicates Cost Share Is Required

b. Organizational Structure

Please provide the Center's Organizational diagram including reporting relationships to host organization, as appropriate. Please include the following information within the organizational diagram.

(NOTE: Organizational Chart image must be a .png or .gif extension and cannot be any larger than 700x700 (10MB)). If you have challenges uploading your image, please contact the Panel Review Manager.

1. Please include the host's overall reporting structure (if applicable).
2. All Employees Name, title and #Years in Position (#years for Senior Management Personnel only). Please use an (*) the Senior Management Personnel within your Center.
3. Please identify whether your Center's board is advisory or fiduciary and where they fit into the overall organizational diagram.
4. Please include all Sub-Recipients in the organizational diagram.

c. Sub-Recipient Funding Allocation

Identified below are the Center's Sub-Recipients and the funding amount allocated for each.

Sub-Recipients in award 70NANB19H004 between 2021-01 to 2021-12

No records to display.

d. Key Partners/Collaborators

In the chart provided below, we have listed the Center's top five partners and collaborators including their key services based on information provided in MEIS. These are partner/collaborators you have identified as organizations who influence the Center's performance (excluding Sub-Recipients which are already identified in your Sub-Recipient Allocation section).

Partner Name	Organization Type	Partner (Formal Contract)	Description of Key Partner Value	Partner Services
College of Engineering	University	No	Internal University service provider.	•
Department of Economic Development	State Commerce/Economic Development Agency	No	Main statewide economic development organization and former holder of the NIST MEP award for the State.	•
Institute of Agricultural and Natural Resources	University	No	Provides institutional oversight of MEP program along with cost share.	•
Office of Research & Economic Development	University	No	Provides cost share.	•
The Food Center	University	No	Key service provider of technical services for food, beverage and pet food manufacturers.	•

II. Performance Measurement and Management

The charts provided on this page and the subsequent pages presents the most recent IMPACT Metrics trends for the Center based on a four-quarter rolling period and a comparison of the IMPACT metrics for the Center to the National Network median, over time. This is to help the Panel and Center understand which elements are a strength or challenge, and to foster discussions about trends, patterns and gaps for each of the IMPACT measures. The data shown in this section and the rest of the CPPR show how the Center is doing meeting the performance standards in three key areas; 1)Impacts, 2) Market Penetration and 3) Financial Viability.

Center IMPACT (Improving Manufacturing Productivity and Competitiveness Tracker) and Trends

Presents the most recent IMPACT Metrics trends for the Center based on a four-quarter rolling period and a comparison of the IMPACT metrics for the Center to the National Network median, over time. This is to help the Panel and Center understand which elements are a strength or challenge, and to foster discussions about trends, patterns and gaps for each of the IMPACT measures. The data shown in this section and the rest of the CPPR show how the Center is doing meeting the performance standards in three key areas; 1)Impacts, 2) Market Penetration and 3) Financial Viability.

Any Manufacturing Extension Partnership - 166

2021-1 - IMPACT Metrics as of Tuesday, August 10, 2021

CAR Operations Performance Management IMPACT Metrics			
CAR Current Quarter Performance			
Federal Funding - \$775,000.09 Total Cash Resources - \$911,335.59 (Four Quarter Rolling Average)			
Impact Metrics			
Metric	CAR Reported Impact	Normalized CAR Performance	Performance Standard
Impact data based on MEP Client Survey responses			
New Sales (10)	\$5.1 M	6.6	15
Retained Sales (10)	\$10.3 M	13.2	35
Jobs Created and Retained (10)	384	495.5	500
New Investment (10)	\$161.1 M	207.8	15
Cost Savings (10)	\$8.9 M	11.5	7
Percent Improving Competitiveness (10)	81.0 / 96.0	84.4%	80%
Net Promoter Score(r) (10)	89.6 - 1.0	88.5	75
Impact data based on Client/Project Submissions			
Mfg.Clients / \$M Fed (15)	89	115.0	73
New Mfg.Clients / \$M Fed (15)	54	70.0	29

Supplemental Data


Survey Response Rate (0)

96.0 / 113.0


85.0

70


Impact Metrics - Any Manufacturing Extension Partnership




New Sales (10)




Retained Sales (10)




Jobs Created and Retained (10)




New Investment (10)




Cost Savings (10)




Percent Improving Competitiveness (10)




Survey Response Rate (10)




Net Promoter Score(r) (10)



Mfg. Clients / \$M Fed (10)



New Mfg. Clients / \$M Fed (10)



a. CAR and MEP Metrics Map


The CAR Metrics Map shows the relationship between quantifiable impact measures (new sales, retained sales, and total cost savings (cost savings + avoid/save investment)) per client and the number of impacted (percent improving competitiveness) clients. Displayed below are a series of “curves” where every point along a given “curve” delivers the same total impact. Movement along a curve simply reflects that the same impact can be achieved with many clients with a lower average impact as with few clients with a higher average impact. The data points/curves that show movement to the right and upper corner show higher total impact and an increase in impacted clients. Data points are based on responses to the NIST MEP Client Survey and are calculated based on a four-quarter rolling average.

The Y-Axis Formula is as follows: $15\% \text{ of Sales (New and Retained) + Cost Savings + Avoid Investment} / \text{Impacted Clients}$.

The X-Axis Formula is as follows: $\text{Number of Impacted Clients (percent improving competitiveness)} / \$M \text{ Fed}$.


The intent of the MEP Metrics Map is to drive Centers and the Panel to observe where the Center is currently. It will also provide an opportunity for the Center to benchmark against other Centers that may be impacting the same number of clients but with larger impacts or Centers that are impacting more clients with the same impact.

CAR Metrics Map for 2021-1



- **\$3M,\$5M, \$10M, \$20M, \$50M and \$100M:** lines represent crude return on investment estimates

MEP Metrics Map for 2021-1



● CAR (ID 166) (X:115, Y:138) ▲ NatNet (X:76, Y:516)

- Any Manufacturing Extension Partnership (166)
- NatNet: Federal funding allocated to the Center Operations Funding Program
- \$3M, \$5M, \$10M, \$20M, \$50M and \$100M: lines represent crude return on investment estimates

b. Based on your performance to date:

i. Performance and Evaluation Management System (PEMS)

Please describe the Center's PEMS. How does the PEMS help the Center achieve a high and sustainable level of performance on the IMPACT Metrics?

N/A

ii. Performance Trends/Patterns

Please review the trends/patterns of the 10 IMPACT Metrics indicators shown on the previous pages.

In looking at the IMPACT Metrics shown on the previous pages, please describe which top four trends tend to stand out to your Center and why? Which metrics are the easiest and hardest for the Center to achieve and what has the Center found that has enabled them to meet the metrics consistently or not?

N/A

iii. Leveraging Performance Metrics

Outside of the IMPACT Metrics, what internal metrics does your Center use to measure performance? How do you foresee these changing?

N/A

iv. Impact of Funding Streams on Performance

If the Center has additional cooperative agreements beyond the Center Operations (Base) agreement (see Center Funding Streams chart in Section I Center Profile); how have these projects affected the Center's resources and overall performance?

N/A

v. Leveraging External Resources to Increase Market Penetration and Improve Performance

How do your Sub-Recipients, 3rd Party Providers and/or Key Partners help the Center achieve greater impact and market penetration?

N/A

vi. Leveraging Oversight Board

Please describe how the Center’s Board supports and contributes to the overall performance of the Center. In particular, please explain how the board composition, terms, and the industries the board members represent are utilized to support the performance of the Center.

N/A

vii. Key Stakeholder Mandates/Requirements

Please identify any major mandates/requirements given by the host, State and/or key stakeholders that require the Center to target specific manufacturers in particular industries, size segments or in geographical areas. How do these requirements affect your performance on the IMPACT Metrics?

N/A

viii. Performance Challenge

Please identify the top challenge that significantly hinders your Center’s ability to improve overall performance now and in the future.

N/A

III. Market Understanding

This section identifies the Center's service territory (regional offices, rural counties and number of manufacturing establishments). The data presented in this section is intended to highlight the Center's ability to achieve both impacts and market penetration. It also identifies the types of businesses working with the Center. These types are compared to either the state or National Network. The data also provides a comparison across employment size and NAICS code.

Based on the Center's analysis of their current market, we begin to learn how this impacts and/or informs the Center's approach for targeting certain types of clients and identifying the appropriate services to meet the challenges of manufacturers.

Finally, the Center has established Operating Outcome goals for Very Small, Rural, Start-Up, Transformational, Other and Unique Manufacturers (shown in the Operating Outcome Table). This table shows the Center's progress towards these goals.

Please look at how the data correlates with the other data points presented within this document to better identify potential best practices and/or gaps in performance. The various data points are intended to show possible indicators for strong or weak performance.

a. Center's Service Territory

Provided below is a map of the Center's service territory as follows:

- Location of Headquarter, Sub-recipient and Field Offices as designated in MEIS.
- Concentration of Rural vs. Urban manufacturers by county within the state.
- Number of manufacturing establishments in the Center's service territory.

b. Center's Manufacturing Clients vs Manufacturing Population in Service Territory

Provided below is a map of the Center's Manufacturing Clients vs Manufacturing Population as follows:

- Number of Center's Manufacturing Clients by zip code (4Q).
- Concentration of Rural vs Urban manufacturers by county in Center's service territory.
- Number of Manufacturing Establishments by county in the Center's service territory.

c. Operating Outcomes Engagement Goals



Identified below are the Center's current outcome goals and progress towards each of these goals, if relevant for the initial three-year operating period. (Please note a Center does not have to be active in every element of the categories identified below).

GOAL	Period	Very Small Establishments < 20 employees	Rural Establishments (Use USDA Definition)	Start-up Establishments	Transformational Clients (NIST MEP Defined)	Other Manufacturers	Total unique manufacturers	Top Line Growth	Bottom Line Growth
Over 3 years (2014-1 - 2016-4)	Goal	22	30	4	10	36	54	65	35
	2014-1								
	2014-2	2	1	1	0	3	6	36%	64%
	2014-3	2	1	0	0	5	8	100%	
	2014-4	1	0	1	0	2	3	100%	
	2015-1								
	2015-2	7	2	4	6	1	8	100%	
	2015-3	3	2	1	0	0	4	50%	50%
	2015-4	1	0	1	0	0	1	100%	
	2016-1								
	2016-2	1	1	0	0	1	2	50%	50%
	2016-3	3	4	0	0	5	10	10%	90%
	2016-4	2	2	0	0	0	3	67%	33%
	Total Unique	15	9	6	6	13	33	64%	36%
	Projected	20	12	8	8	17	44	68%	32%


Over 2 years (2017-1 - 2018-4)												
Goal	19	32	N/A	4	37	100	27	73				
2017-1	2	1	0	0	0	2	100%					
2017-2	3	4	2	1	2	9	11%	89%				
2017-3	5	12	1	0	6	22	5%	95%				
2017-4	3	2	2	0	3	7	29%	71%				
2018-1	0	1	0	0	4	5	40%	60%				
2018-2	3	6	0	0	4	11	18%	82%				
2018-3	9	12	2	0	8	25	4%	96%				
2018-4	3	9	1	0	6	17		100%				
Total Unique	22	33	6	1	26	74	11%	89%				
Projected	22	33	6	1	26	74	26%	74%				
Over 3 years (2019-1 - 2021-4)												
Goal	20	34	1	15	45	105	30	70				
2019-1	2	4	0	0	3	8	56%	44%				
2019-2	6	8	2	0	7	18	17%	83%				
2019-3	6	12	2	0	4	21		100%				
2019-4	12	19	4	0	13	40	5%	95%				
2020-1	5	8	1	0	4	15		100%				
2020-2	3	11	1	0	9	23		100%				
2020-3	14	32	7	0	24	63	24%	76%				
2020-4	9	15	5	0	13	33	62%	38%				
2021-1	8	12	3	2	12	27	37%	63%				
2021-2	1	2	0	0	3	6		100%				
2021-3												

Over 3 years (2019-1 - 2021-4)	2021-4									
	Total Unique									
Projected	46	74	15	2	47	143	24%	76%		
	55	89	18	2	56	172	20%	80%		


d. Client Mix



Client Mix by Industry Vs. NatNet




Dollar Impact Distribution by Industry



Note: The NAICS codes identified above represent the following:


- 31-"Consumables" (Food, Apparel, etc)
- 32-"Resources, Chemicals and Non-Metals"
- 33-"Metals, Electronics and Transportation"
- Other-"NAICS - 423510, 488991, 54171x, 541330, 541380, 561910, 811310"

Client Mix by Geography Vs. State Distribution




e. Client Challenges / Needs

Client Challenges




f. Service Delivery by Substance



g. Projects by Project Mode

Projects by Project Mode



Assessment Implementation Training

Period data is 4Q Average

h. Based on your market understanding and the data shown in this section:

i. Recent Market Analysis

When was the last market analysis completed by the Center? Please describe how your Center leveraged the results from the market analysis to inform your approach to the market? What is the Center's future plans for market analysis?

N/A

ii. Center Service Delivery Locations

Please describe the Center's approach for identifying service delivery locations and how these locations enable the Center to reach all manufacturers in the state? How has this distribution of service delivery locations affected the Center's performance?

N/A

iii. Center Operating Outcomes

Please describe how your Center uses the progress towards the established Operating Outcome Goals (refer to table in this section) to self-assess performance? How has the emphasis on these types of clients (i.e., Rural, Very Small, Start Up, Transformational, etc) affected the Center's overall performance?

N/A

iv. Client Mix

Does the center segment the market in terms of client mix around the three dimensions or size, geography and/or industry? How has the Center's client mix led to the performance your Center is experiencing today and how do you see this current mix changing based on data shown in this section?

N/A

v. Greatest Opportunities of Dimensions

Which of the dimensions (size, geography and/or industry) provide the greatest opportunity to serve more clients and generate greater impacts? Please describe.

N/A

vi. Responding to Client Challenges

How do you see your Center's service delivery offerings shifting to address the challenges of your clients (as shown in the Client Challenges Chart)?

N/A

vii. Challenges Addressing the Market

Based on the data and the questions presented in this section, what is the Center's main challenge for understanding and addressing the needs of manufacturer's in the state? What do you think would help you respond more effectively to these needs?

N/A

IV. Business Model and Management

In this section, the data and graphics are designed to assess the existing and changing needs of clients and services being requested. This section is designed to have the Center consider, and to highlight, how this information can assist in strategies moving forward to develop more clients and projects, and leverage the associated impacts.

a. Business Model Overview

Please describe your Business Model and how your model supports the execution of your Center's Strategy and the MEP National Network™ Strategic Plan. Please include the role that sub-recipients (where applicable), 3rd party providers, and other partners such as industry associations, universities, community/technical colleges, economic development organizations and Federal, State and local government agencies support the execution of your business model.

N/A

b. Client Engagement Model

Please describe the client engagement model the Center uses in serving manufacturers. Please describe the process your Center goes through from first engagement with the client to completion of the survey.

N/A


c. FTE Overview

The charts provided below identify the Center's FTE distribution and FTE per \$M Fed over a specific time-frame based on information provided by the Center in MEIS. **(Note: FTEs must include sub-recipient staff count where appropriate).** If this information is incorrect, please update in MEIS.


Note: The data provided in the stacked bar chart below is based on averages.

i. FTE Distribution by Technical, Sales, Management and Other

FTE Distribution by Technical, Sales, Management and Other




FTE Per \$M Fed



d. Service Delivery by Hours

In the bar chart provided below is the Center's distribution of services provided by the Center (in-house) versus 3rd Party Providers as presented in MEIS. If this information is inaccurate, please update the information in MEIS. **Note: This information is based on CAR and TPP reported project hours over the Center's current cooperative agreement lifecycle.**


Service Delivery: 3rd Party Hours Vs. In-House Hours




Period data is 4Q Average

e. Capacity Utilization Indicators


i. Clients per Delivery FTE




ii. Projects Per Client




iii. Hours Per Client




iv. Projects Per \$M Fed



v. Project Intensity Distribution




vi. Total Project Value Per Hour



vii. Hours per Delivery FTE

Hours Per Delivery FTE



Period data is 4Q Average

f. Based on Your Center's Business Model and Management:

i. Business and Client Engagement Model - Effectiveness in Reaching More Clients and Generating Impacts

How does your business and client engagement model enable the Center to reach the greatest number of clients and generate the most impact?

N/A

ii. Organizational Structure-Promoting Future Performance Growth

How does your Center's organizational structure support your performance and how will this support future performance growth?

N/A

iii. Management of Sub-Recipients, 3rd Party Providers and Key Partners

Please describe how your Center manages Sub-Recipient, 3rd Party Providers, Key Partners and Stakeholders so that the Center performance and brand is a priority?

N/A

iv. Process to Identify and Implement New Products and/or Services

What is the process the Center uses to identify new products and/or services? How does the Center balance innovation/product service development with sustaining and improving performance? How is the staffing and/or use of external resources deployed to implement new products or services?

N/A

v. Plans for Building Capacity

Does your Center see investing in new initiatives as an opportunity to improve performance? Why or why not? Please describe.

N/A

vi. Performance Continuity

Does your Center have a risk mitigation plan in place to effectively transfer organizational knowledge and expertise as your Center experiences turnover of staff to avoid potential adverse effects on Center performance? If so, please describe key elements of your Center's plan. If not, what is the approach your Center will take in the event this happens?

N/A

vii. Business Model and Management Challenge

When thinking about your business model, client engagement model, internal and external resources you have available to serve the manufacturers in your state, what would you say is your biggest challenge that may impact your overall performance?

N/A

V. Financial Viability

In this section, the focus is on the Center's ability to manage, leverage and execute financial resources. The table below shows the Center's cost share portfolio over time. The budget table also shows the utilization of federal funding over time which may provide some insight to challenges the Center faces in leveraging all sources of funding. The table shows changes since the start of the cooperative agreement.

a. Center Federal Funding - Requested vs Expended

The table below identifies the Center's requested annual Federal and Non-Federal funding vs. what the Center expended for each of the operating years. The current year shows year to date progress based on the latest reported information. Also identified in the table is the Center's projected Federal funding and Non-Federal cost share for future operation years.

Eligible Federal Funding: \$675,000.00

	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5	
	Actual as of: 2014-12-31	Budget	Actual as of: 2015-12-31	Budget	Actual as of: 2016-12-31	Budget	Actual as of: 2017-12-31	Budget	Actual as of: 2018-12-31	Budget
Revenue (Federal and Non-Federal Cost Share)										
NIST MEP Funds		\$600,000.00	\$186,695.00	\$329,431.00	\$350,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$90,732.81	\$268,560.00	\$444,815.19	\$495,173.00
NIST MEP Supplemental Funds										
Unexpended Federal Funds (From prior operating year) to be used ABOVE base			\$165,000.00	\$165,000.00						
Unexpended Federal Funds (From prior operating year) to be used TOWARD base			\$270,569.00	\$270,569.00	\$250,000.00	\$401,702.00	\$331,440.00	\$331,440.00	\$104,827.00	\$104,827.00
Applicant Contribution Cash										
State/Local Funds										
State/Local Cash		\$134,263.00	\$102,775.91	\$244,311.00	\$243,656.00	\$344,287.00	\$333,551.14	\$340,766.00	\$368,554.28	\$379,724.00
State/Local In-Kind			\$42,928.00							
Unexpended Program Income (From prior operating year)					\$565.00	\$565.00			\$22,347.53	\$32,800.00
Program Income			\$33,089.09	\$33,089.00	\$96,686.00	\$70,971.00	\$182,009.00	\$157,541.00	\$159,034.00	\$187,475.00
<i>Total Other</i>										
Total Other Cash					\$60,879.00					
Total Other In-Kind		\$30,247.00	\$90,015.00	\$86,653.00	\$38,454.00	\$6,582.00				
Total Revenue (Federal and Non-Federal Cost Share)		\$764,510.00	\$891,072.00	\$1,129,053.00	\$1,040,240.00	\$1,174,107.00	\$937,732.95	\$1,098,307.00	\$1,099,578.00	\$1,199,999.00

	Year 6		Year 7		Year 8		Year 9		Year 10	
	Actual as of: 2019-12-31	Budget	Actual as of: 2020-12-31	Budget	Actual as of: 2021-05-31	Budget	Actual as of: N/A	Budget	Actual as of: N/A	Budget
Revenue (Federal and Non-Federal Cost Share)										
NIST MEP Funds	\$675,000.00	\$675,000.00	\$657,938.00	\$657,938.00	\$220,223.00	\$775,000.00		\$775,000.00		\$775,000.00
NIST MEP Supplemental Funds										
Unexpended Federal Funds (From prior operating year) to be used ABOVE base										
Unexpended Federal Funds (From prior operating year) to be used TOWARD base			\$117,062.00	\$117,062.00						
Applicant Contribution Cash										
<i>State/Local Funds</i>										
State/Local Cash	\$408,456.00	\$408,456.00	\$143,107.00	\$127,184.00	\$49,351.00	\$83,726.00		\$441,962.00		\$444,000.00
State/Local In-Kind										
Unexpended Program Income (From prior operating year)			\$9,832.00	\$9,857.00	\$32,220.00	\$7,967.00				
Program Income	\$165,235.00	\$165,235.00	\$107,926.00	\$26,688.00	\$54,606.00			\$333,038.00		\$331,000.00
<i>Total Other</i>										
Total Other Cash										
Total Other In-Kind										
Total Revenue (Federal and Non-Federal Cost Share)	\$1,248,691.00	\$1,248,691.00	\$1,035,865.00	\$938,729.00	\$356,400.00	\$866,693.00		\$1,550,000.00		\$1,550,000.00

b. Based on your Center Financials:

i. Leveraging Unexpended Federal Funds and Unexpended Program Income

If your Center has Unexpended Federal Funds and/or Unexpended Program Income, please explain how this came about and how your Center plans to leverage these funds to support future activities and performance.

N/A

ii. Cost Share Contingency Plan

If the Center was faced with a potential reduction/loss of cost share – what is the contingency plan the Center has in place to avoid a negative impact on continuity of service and performance? Please describe.

N/A

iii. Effect of State Funding

Please describe any State funding the Center receives (direct or indirect) and how it impacts the centers programming, market penetration or impact achievement? Does your Center receive funding from the State to subsidize projects with manufacturers? If so, how has this impacted your overall performance?

N/A

iv. Potential Challenge/Barrier to Meet Cost Share Requirements

What would your Center identify as a potential challenge/barrier for meeting the program's cost share requirement and how does this effect Center performance and your strategy?

N/A

VI. National Network Citizen

The MEP National Network is comprised of MEP Centers working together to leverage capabilities in collaboration with NIST MEP and key industry and stakeholder partners. The MEP National Network enhances each individual Center's ability to serve more manufacturers with more diverse services and increases market penetration, impact and new project opportunities. By leveraging staff expertise across the Network, Centers can quickly offer new services or augment existing services and access expanded resources that can respond to the market needs. Manufacturers benefit by getting the right service at the right time. Because of limited resources, individual Centers do not always have the capacity or capability to respond to every challenge a manufacturer may encounter. Leveraging Network capabilities empowers Centers to bring powerful solutions to companies in a timely manner at an affordable rate.

a. Based on the Intent of the National Network:

i. Contribution to National Network

Please describe a single best practice at your Center that you are willing to share with the National Network. How has this best practice affected your Center's performance (please include quantitative data)?

N/A

ii. Leveraging a Best Practice from the National Network

Please describe a Center best practice you have applied from another Center that's had a positive impact on your Center's overall performance. Please include where this improvement is shown in the IMPACT Metrics.

N/A

iii. Importance of the National Network as a Benchmark

To what extent is the National Network an important benchmark for your Center as it relates to improving performance? If your center benchmarks against a smaller cohort vs. the entire National Network, what are the characteristics to which you compare? Geography, Center structure, industry mix or something outside of these categories? If the National Network isn't one your Center uses, please describe the group(s) to which your Center actively benchmarks against and why.

N/A

iv. National Network Challenge

What is your Center's greatest challenge of operating within a more integrated Network?

N/A

Appendix 1

The reporting periods used for charts in this document are based on first full 4 quarters worth of data from the start of the awards used for this review up through last full 4 quarters worth of data based on today.

Funding Agreement Number	Recipient	Start Quarter	End Quarter
70NANB14H013	Board of Regents	2014-1	2018-4
70NANB19H004	Board of Regents	2019-1	2023-4

Year	Start Quarter	End Quarter
1	2013-2	2014-1
2	2014-2	2015-1
3	2015-2	2016-1
4	2016-2	2017-1
5	2017-2	2018-1
6	2018-2	2019-1
7	2019-2	2020-1
8	2020-2	2021-1