## 2016-2019 Data Comparisons \& Trends

More than $\mathbf{7 0 \%}$ of budget is directly invested in granting programs


## Dollars Distributed by Grant Program

2019 DOLLAR AMOUNT AWARDED BY PROGRAM


2016 DOLLAR AMOUNT AWARDED BY PROGRAM



## IAC Regional Map

## Counties Directly Funded in FY16 \& FY19

FY16 Amount Awarded \$3,144,875.44

FY16 Number of Grants
446
FY16 Counties Funded
67


FY19


FY19 Amount Awarded
\$3,395,006.90

FY19 Number of Grants
502
FY19 Counties Funded
71


## FY19 Initiative Impressions

Impressions by IAC Initiatives

## Counties Impacted

78


## FY18 Grant Funded Activities

Impressions by IAC Grant Funded Activities
1,392

Counties Served
92
$\square 0$ activities
$1-5$ activities
$6-10$ activities
$11-20$ activities
$21-30$ activities
31-40 activities
$40+$ activites

## Regional Initiative Grant Program Growth Comparison

*AII* Program Growth FY16 - FY19
Grantees

| \$3,450,000.00 |  |  | \$2,550,000.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$3,400,000.00 |  |  | \$2,500,000.00 |
| \$3,350,000.00 |  | \$3,395,006.90 502 Grantees | \$2,450,000.00 |
| \$3,300,000.00 |  |  | \$2,400,000.00 |
| \$3,250,000.00 |  |  | \$2,350,000.00 |
| \$3,200,000.00 |  |  | \$2,300,000.00 |
|  |  |  | \$2,250,000.00 |
| \$3,150,000.00 |  |  | \$2,200,000,00 |
| \$3,100,000.00 | \$3,144,875.44 |  |  |
|  | 446 Grantees |  | \$2,150,000.00 |
| \$3,050,000.00 |  |  | \$2,100,000.00 |
| \$3,000,000.00 |  |  | \$2,050,000.00 |

Dollar Amount Funded

- FY16 - FY19
*Only RIG* Program Growth FY19-FY20
Grantees



## FY20 Regional Initiative Grant AOS Staff

FY20 AOS I \& II Applicants with Full-Time Staff


## Of the 189 AOS Applicants:

- 24 are completely volunteer run (13\%)
- 45 are run by part time staff (24\%)
- 28 have 1 full time staff (14\%)
- 153 have 4 or less full time paid staff ( $81 \%$ )


## Trends/Summary

- The Arts are growing every year - across the state, but mostly in the urban centers - equity is increasingly becoming an issue.
- Despite our efforts, we still struggle to reach rural areas of Indiana.
- Overall, we've seen consistent growth, and in particular in our Regional Initiative Grant Program (our largest grant program) with a spike in demand in FY20. From FY19 to FY20, there was a $13 \%$ increase in funded applications. Over a four year period, this program has increased by $36 \%$. However, our budget for FY2O has decreased by 2\%.


## Questions? Contact us

Paige Sharp
Deputy Director of Programs
psharp@iac.in.gov
(317) 232-1279


## Deanna Poelsma

Grants, Research, and Information Technology Manager
dpoelsma@iac.in.gov
(317) 232-1283

## Rural vs Urban FY19 Data Comparison

## Our Primary Questions

Are IAC grant awards distributed equitably? What about IAC grant dollars? Is urban Indiana benefiting more than rural Indiana?

## Defining Rural and Urban: Indiana Counties by Population



- Indiana is predominantly rural $71 \%$ of its counties have a population of 50K or less.
$34 \%$ of its counties are super rural - qualified as having a population of 25 K or less.
- But, most people live in urban Indiana $63 \%$ of Hoosiers live in 17 counties (red/orange). Rural counties only represent $26 \%$ of the state's total population.
- Fun Fact: Almost $1 / 3$ of our population lives in 4 counties! (Allen, Hamilton, Lake, Marion).

Population of Indiana CountiesStripe overlay indicates the county did not receive funding in 2019Super Rural: 25,000 and underRural: 25,001-50,000Mid-Range: 50,001-100,000Urban: 100,001-300,000
Super Urban: 301,000+

## Population Breakdown

## Counties directly served by all grant programs

At first glance, we're doing a pretty good job.

- $78 \%$ of all counties receive direct funding from the IAC representing $93 \%$ of the population.

While this seems good, we're still missing the everywhere mark in our mission.

- 20 counties from both Rural and Super Rural areas did not receive direct funding, representing $7 \%$ of the population.

|  | Number of Counties | \% of Counties | \% of Population | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# Co } \\ \text { Served } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Co } \\ & \text { Served } \end{aligned}$ | \% of Population Served |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Super Rural | 31 | 33.7\% | 7.7\% | 17 | 18.5\% | 4.2\% |
| Rural | 34 | 37.0\% | 18.6\% | 28 | 30.4\% | 15.2\% |
| Mid Range | 10 | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 10 | 10.9\% | 10.9\% |
| Urban | 13 | 14.1\% | 30.9\% | 13 | 14.1\% | 30.9\% |
| Super Urban | 4 | 4.3\% | 32.0\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 32.0\% |

## Program Reach

\% of Counties Served: RIG \& AOSIII VS. All Programs


## Where does the money go?

- The majority of our funding goes to Urban Indiana
- 75\% of grant award dollars go to Urban and Super Urban counties, which represent 63\% of the population and $19 \%$ of all counties in the state.
- $45 \%$ of our grant funding goes to 4 counties
- Only $6 \%$ of all grant funds go to Super Rural counties, home to $8 \%$ of our population ( 31 counties).
- $82 \%$ of all grant funding goes to RIG \& AOSIII. Roughly $30 \%$ of all counties did not receive direct support through these programs in FY19.
- $23 \%$ of all funds awarded goes to AOS grantees with budgets over 1 million.


## RIG \& AOSIII Activity Map



While 27 counties are not directly served through our AOS and APS programs, every county is served by activities that result from these grant awards.

## In Summary

## Let's Talk

- What are the strengths you see in the data as it relates to serving all the citizens in our state?
- What are the weaknesses?
- If anything, what do you think the Commission needs to address going forward?
- How might we advance or adjust our structure, partnerships, programs, criteria and/or communications/engagement to help address any perceived challenges or opportunities?
- What might be the role of Commissioners in helping to address these challenges or opportunities?
- How does this information, in turn, inform advocacy messaging and strategies?


## Questions? Contact us

Paige Sharp
Deputy Director of Programs
psharp@iac.in.gov
(317) 232-1279


## Deanna Poelsma

Grants, Research, and Information Technology Manager
dpoelsma@iac.in.gov
(317) 232-1283

## Participation and Demographics Served

## Previous Presentation Follow-up

## Funding Equity

## What does funding distribution look like on the community level?

In Region 8

- $60 \%$ of grant awards go to one community
- $80 \%$ go to two communities

| Region 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cities Funded | \# of Direct Awards | \% of total awards made in Region | \$ Amount of Direct Awards | \% of total \$ awarded in Region | County | \# of Direct Awards | \$ Amount of Direct Awards |
| Bloomfield | 1 | 2\% | \$ 6,807.00 | 3\% | Brown | 10 | \$ 67,779.00 |
| Bloomington | 30 | 60\% | \$ 138,044.00 | 58\% | Greene | 3 | \$ 12,807.00 |
| Coal City | 1 | 2\% | \$ 1,406.00 | 1\% | Lawrence | 0 |  |
| Ellettsville | 1 | 2\% | \$ 5,000.00 | 2\% | Martin | 0 | \$ |
| Jasonville | 2 | 4\% | \$ 6,000.00 | 3\% | Monroe | 31 | \$ 143,044.00 |
| Nashville | 10 | 20\% | \$ 67,779.00 | 29\% | Morgan | 0 |  |
| Paoli | 1 | 2\% | \$ 3,256.00 | 1\% | Orange | 2 | \$ 5,256.00 |
| Spencer | 3 | 6\% | \$ 6,900.00 | 3\% | Owen | 4 | \$ 8,306.00 |
| West Baden Springs | 1 | 2\% | \$ 2,000.00 | 1\% | Total: | 50 | \$ 237,192.00 |
| Total: | 50 | 100\% | \$ 237,192.00 | 100\% |  |  |  |
| Total \# Cities: | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# Cities Funded: | 9 | 17\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# Cities Not Funded: | 43 | 83\% |  |  |  |  |  |

## Biggest Takeaway

17\% of Indiana communities receive direct grant funding.

We don't know what \% of the population this represents.

## Total Participation

## Arts Organization Support (FY19)

Total Number of AOS Participants
AOS separated from other programs due to volume

Grantees reported over 5 million "in person" participants

17 AOSIII grantees served more than AOSI \& II grantees combined (167 total)


Average Number of AOS Participants per Grantee


## Total Participation

## Project-Based Grant Programs

Total Number of Participants by
Project-Based Grant Program


Average Number of Participants per Grantee by Grant Program


- Nearly 400,000 reported in-person participants
- APS, by far, has the greatest participation (overall and on average)
- 151 APS grantees $=350,000$ participants $/$ Other 135 grantees $=42,000$ participants


## Participation by Groups NEA Definitions

## Required by the NEA, we ask grantees:

## Who made up 25\% or

more of your total
audience?
Direct participants only

## Age:

- 0-18 Years of Age
- 19-24 Years of Age
- 25-64 Years of Age
- Age 65+ Years of Age


## Race/Ethnicity:

- Asian
- Black/African American
- Hispanic / Latino
- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- White


## Distinct Groups:

- Individual with Disabilities
- Individuals in Institutions (People living In hospitals, hospices, nursing homes, assisted care facilities, correctional facilities, and homeless facilities.)
- Military Veterans/Active duty personnel
- Individuals below the Poverty line
- Individuals with limited English proficiency
- Youth at risk


## Racial/Ethnic Groups

## Racial/Ethnic Demographics of Indiana



- Asian
- Hispanic / Latino

■ Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander - Bi-Racial

- Black / African American - American Indian / Alaska Native $■$ White


## Grantees Serving Racial/Ethnic Groups

(Representing 25\% or more of total participants)


## Racial/Ethnic Groups <br> By Region

## Regionally:

- In general, regions appear to be serving constituents that make up their respective communities.
- However, region 9 struggles to reach diverse audience, despite having diverse representation in their community.


## Who Else is Participating?

## Distinct Groups Served by Grantees



Age Groups Served by Grantees

- Age 0-18



## Racial/Ethnic \& Distinct Groups By Program

Distinct Groups Served by Program
$\square$ Grantees Who Served $\quad$ Grantees Who Did Not Serve


Minority Groups Served by Program
$■$ Grantees Who Served ■Grantees Who Did Not Serve


## Major Takeaways

- While AOSIII serves, by far, the most individuals, they serve the least diverse group of constituents. Given our emphasis on IDEA, we need to find ways to capture their increased efforts.
- Majority of grantees serve adults between ages 25-64.
- Of the Distinct Groups, individuals below the poverty line are highest served.
- Of Racial/Ethnic Groups, Black/African American individuals are the highest served. Great to see we're keeping pace with our state.
- We can see the results of targeted programs like PACE.


## Questions? Contact Us!

Paige Sharp
Deputy Director of Programs
psharp@iac.in.gov
(317) 232-1279


## Deanna Poelsma

Grants, Research, and Information Technology Manager
dpoelsma@iac.in.gov
(317) 232-1283

