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Foreword

When this program evaluation project of Pennsylvania Performing Arts on Tour was launched in January 2012 by the Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and its four Funding Partners—The Heinz Endowments, The Pew Charitable Trusts, the William Penn Foundation and the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts, our nation was emerging from the worst economic crises since the Great Depression. It was a time of unprecedented economic uncertainty and profound challenge for 296 Pennsylvania touring artists, 160 non-roster artists and the 700+ presenting organizations who had been involved in PennPAT since its creation 17 years ago. Not unlike nonprofit organizations and entrepreneurs were experiencing in every other sector across the country, it was a time of forced reflection, assessment, and reimagining futures. Everyone was scrambling to figure out “what’s next,” and then how to successfully adapt to those new realities. Choices for Pennsylvania’s touring artists and their presenting organizations spanned a continuum from complete transformation to complete cessation of activity that was no longer sustainable. For most, these options were simultaneously invigorating and somewhat terrifying.

In fall 2011 when this PennPAT evaluation project was designed by the Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and its four Funding Partners, its intent was to measure the impacts experienced by artists and presenters during 2009-2012. Its intent was also to calculate effects of 2009-2012 on the overall touring artist/presenter ecology and inform next steps assuring PennPAT’s future service relevance and value. In addition to its unprecedented financial investment in the careers of touring artists—more than any single state in U.S. history—was PennPAT’s hallmark support services. PennPAT’s internationally renowned effective stewardship, according to PennPAT participants, not only responded to but anticipated and strategically fueled actions that would stimulate and propel their touring careers. Continuous rigorous evaluation over the 15 years of the program informed PennPAT support services keeping them relevant and valuable.

PennPAT worked brilliantly. Over the 15-year history of PennPAT, a $9.06 million investment of its four Funding Partners leveraged more than $19.7 million in performance fees for 296 PennPAT artists, making it possible for hundreds of thousands of people to have high quality, professional arts experiences. More than 700 different presenters with 2,179 PennPAT grants enabled Pennsylvania’s touring artists to tour and connect with presenters in 25 states and jurisdictions. An additional $138,00 in grants also created opportunities for Pennsylvania artists to perform in 31 countries on five continents.
No one ever imagined in the fall of 2011 that PennPAT itself also would be faced with the challenges of forced reflection, assessment, and reimagining its future. Based on the results of its own strategic planning, the William Penn Foundation announced, in April 2012, that 2013 would be its final year of PennPAT support. This determination begged the fundamental question for the Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and its three remaining Funding Partners: could the collaboration that made PennPAT successful and strong continue with one less funding partner? Given challenging economic realities was PennPAT sustainable, and given the changing needs of the touring ecosystem, should all of PennPAT, in fact, be sustained? Were PennPAT’s four cornerstones—financial support, the artist roster, community engagement, and its portfolio of technical assistance and support services—still the right cornerstones?

The four Funding Partners and the Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation also found themselves in a period of forced reflection, assessment, and reimagining PennPAT’s future. Might this unplanned shift among PennPAT’s Funding Partners provide opportunities to streamline and further improve program reach and effectiveness?

By May, 2012, all four Funding partners and the Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation, agreed to expand the evaluation’s scope from a 2009-2012 PennPAT program assessment, to a comprehensive review of all programs since PennPAT’s inception. Additionally it sought field inputs and wisdom from touring artists and presenters (both within and outside the realm of PennPAT users) to inform thinking about what relevant, valuable 21st Century support systems in a rapidly changing tour ecology might be?

It is the hope of all those who have capably led, managed, and generously funded PennPAT since its creation plus the more than 500 touring artists and presenters who participated in this evaluation project that that this comprehensive report and its 250-page companion report documenting all findings, will inform thinking, serve as the primary comprehensive data source about PennPAT investment and stewardship services, and provide insight helping to illuminate a clear path ahead. We look forward to the next iteration of PennPAT and its effective strengthening of the touring ecology in ways that will boost accessibility and use of support services among all Pennsylvania’s touring artists and increase ever widening audience participation.
The purpose of Pennsylvania Performing Arts on Tour (PennPAT) is to increase opportunities for professional Pennsylvania-based performing artists to obtain successful touring engagements.
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A. Introduction and History

Pennsylvania Performing Arts on Tour, known as PennPAT, is a nationally unprecedented public/private partnership that was created in 1996 by four Funding Partners—The Heinz Endowments, The Pew Charitable Trusts, the William Penn Foundation and the Pennsylvania Council on the Arts—and administered by Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation to support the ecology of presenting and touring for Pennsylvania’s performing artists, both within and outside the Commonwealth. As uniquely distinguished as its A–Z portfolio of financial support and technical assistance is PennPAT’s funding construct. Participants in this study believe the strategic partnership of the state arts agency and these foundations, with their combined assets in excess of $7.5 billion, have impacted artists’ touring in profound ways that the Funders could only have achieved collectively.

Nationally and internationally known, PennPAT has been capably administered since its inception by MAAF. The program’s first and only director Katie West was hired in 1997, and an office was created in Center City Philadelphia as PennPAT’s headquarters.

At the core of PennPAT is its artist roster that includes Pennsylvania-based performing artists selected through a rigorous panel review process. Selection criteria include artistic quality and tour-readiness. PennPAT has continually evolved to meet the needs of touring artists.

The value of touring is not only expressed in money. To have the opportunity to reach new people to express ourselves and have the opportunity to receive feedback can only help us grow as an ensemble. It affords us the opportunity to express what we do and what our lives are about.

PennPAT Roster Ensemble
In its first three years of existence, PennPAT focused its efforts on supporting touring engagements by professional Pennsylvania performing artists within Pennsylvania, and assisting those artists with tour-readiness through grants, training, and marketing support. It gradually expanded its geographic reach and added activities to deepen its impact.

In 2001, PennPAT began awarding grants for roster artist touring engagements to presenters in the entire mid-Atlantic region and Ohio. North Carolina was included in the eligible region between 2005 and 2008 through a partnership with the North Carolina Arts Council. Programmatic additions over the years included an artist retreat, showcasing opportunities at networking and booking conferences, one-on-one consultations, workshops and webinars, and additional grant opportunities for both artists and presenters.

It is important to know that while presenters play as important a role in touring as artists, presenters have not been central to PennPAT’s mission.

B. Evaluation Methodology and Environmental Factors

This evaluation report was commissioned by Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and its four Funding Partners. Initially, the purpose of the evaluation was to assess the impact of the program on its two primary beneficiaries, roster artists and presenters, their respective levels of participation, and the factors that enable or inhibit that participation. Originally, the study timeframe was 2009 – 2012 and the study universe included artists and presenters who had received funding as well as those who applied and did not. The initial scope of the evaluation also included an environmental scan of touring activity in the United States and identification of, and comparison with, other state-based touring programs.
Consultants were selected in December 2011, and by January project scope and timeline were confirmed. By February 2012, the evaluation process was underway.

In April 2012, Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation learned of impending changes in PennPAT’s funding. William Penn Foundation, one of the four Funding Partners, had changed priorities and it was projected that 2013 would be its final year of support. At that point, all Funding Partners agreed to proceed with the evaluation, but revise its scope. Rather than a three-year analysis of program impacts between 2009 and 2012, the evaluation would be reframed through a 15-year lens to measure impacts and perceptions over the life of the program. The evaluation would focus on the PennPAT model and its impact on the overall ecology of touring. Roster artists and presenters who participated at any point in time since the program’s inception would be surveyed to gather perceptions: what worked, what didn’t, and what could be better.

Fifteen years of PennPAT artist and presenter data files and reports, as well as every PennPAT evaluation report ever commissioned, were shared with the consultant team for analysis and inclusion in this study.1 Also, it was decided that a sampling of presenters in the mid-Atlantic region who never used PennPAT would be surveyed. Data from these non-users about touring and presenter priorities would be used for comparative purposes as well as providing outside perceptions of PennPAT.

Project objectives were reframed:
1. Understand PennPAT’s value to the mission and future goals of Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and the four Funding Partners;
2. Learn what is most important to artists, presenters, and managers/agents in today’s environment—and how PennPAT could be more proactive and more responsive;
3. Provide Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and the Funding Partners with a deeper understanding of what is influencing program use and trends;
4. Discover how PennPAT roster artists’ experiences and perceptions of value compare with artists’ experiences and perceptions of value of other national touring programs;
5. Determine how findings could be applied to increase program value, reach, and relevance to more presenting artists and to communities within and outside the PennPAT funding region;
6. Provide information to guide future decisions about PennPAT’s funding construct and program infrastructure, especially with attention to technology.

---

1 Appendix A
Other adjustments were made in methodology to encourage an adequate response rate. Because evaluation has always been an expectation of roster artists and presenters receiving funds, there was no concern initially about response rates. However, given the uncertainty of funding and speculation that this could be PennPAT’s final evaluation, Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation increased messaging to artists and presenters that would encourage their participation and added cash and gift card incentives.

A second concern surfaced. Given that this could be PennPAT’s final evaluation, efforts were made to confront the role of emotion in how artists and presenters might respond. Some might hesitate to be critical thinking a favorable report might influence program continuation. To fully cultivate participants’ experience, best thinking, and wisdom, everyone was encouraged to reimagine PennPAT and contribute as many ideas as possible to inform what a refreshed PennPAT could be. What kinds of programs and services could best support 21st century touring?

By January 31, 2013, with input from 143 roster artists and 257 presenters through surveys, interviews, focus groups, and an exhaustive analysis of data, the evaluation was complete.

This report strives to increase the understanding of PennPAT’s impacts and—to the extent possible—illuminate perceptions about program relevance and value to artists, presenters, and presenters’ communities. And lastly, a representative sample of PennPAT artists, artist managers/agents, and presenters were invited to reimagine PennPAT in ways that might better address the 21st century opportunities and challenges of touring artists.

A 250-page companion report contains all evaluation data that support the findings in this document. Because statistics are not nearly as compelling as the voices of those who experienced, created, and lived it, we also include substantial qualitative data.
Evaluation Respondent Universe
As detailed in this chart, all 296 artists ever on the PennPAT roster were surveyed for this report and 143 responded for a rate of 48%. The fact there was such close proportional alignment between the profile of artists participating in this study and PennPAT’s actual universe (in terms of geography, artistic discipline, and race) indicates opinion closely reflects reality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENNPAT ARTIST PROFILE</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe (n=296)</th>
<th>Percentage of PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>Percentage of Survey Sample (n=143)</th>
<th>Variance between PennPAT Universe and Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Philadelphia Region</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pittsburgh Region</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other PA Region</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dance</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Music</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Theater</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. White/Caucasian</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Black/African American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Multi-Racial[1]</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Multi-Racial: no more than 50% of the group members are from one racial category.
Presenter response rates were 24% for PennPAT’s direct participants, and, for comparative purposes, input was sought from non-PennPAT presenters in the region; 14% responded. Incentives were offered to boost the artist and two presenter surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENTERS IN REGION</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. PennPAT Presenters (Grantees/Participants)</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Other Presenters (Non-User Presenters in Region)</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Presenters</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since PennPAT’s inception 734 presenters have applied for or received PennPAT grants. Other PennPAT presenters may utilize the program but not be grantees.

These regional presenters have no documented history with the PennPAT program during the past 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PENNPAT PRESENTERS</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. PennPAT Presenters (Grantees/Participations in PA)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. PennPAT Presenters (Grantees/Participants outside of PA)</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PennPAT Presenters</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 734 presenters that have received one or more PennPAT grants approximately 35% have been within PA and 65% outside of PA. The survey results reflect 31% PA presenters and 69% out of state presenters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Presenters: University-affiliated</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Presenters: Independent (not University-affiliated)</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PennPAT Presenters</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 734 presenters that have received one or more PennPAT grants approximately 25% have been university-affiliated and 75% independent. The survey results reflect 28% university-affiliated and 72% independent presenters.
PennPAT has been credited by artists and presenters as the most comprehensive statewide program ever created in the nation to support touring artists, their presenters, and their communities. Over the 15-year history of PennPAT, a $9.06 million investment of its four Funding Partners has leveraged more than $19.7 million in performance fees for 296 PennPAT artists, making it possible for hundreds of thousands of people to have high quality, professional arts experiences.

**The national profile of Pennsylvania touring artists is high.** PennPAT has provided more than 700 different presenters with 2,179 grants enabling roster artists to tour and connect with presenters in 25 states and jurisdictions. Presenters who use the program—as well as those who have never used it—tell us PennPAT’s trademark is a mark of excellence.

**The program’s financial support of touring since 1997 through fee support to those who present PennPAT artists and direct grants to PennPAT artists is, by far, the most valuable aspect of the program.** Aggregate support to the nine mid-Atlantic states and jurisdictions—Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, U.S. Virgin Islands, Virginia, and West Virginia—is just over $8.29 million.
Section Two: Overview of PennPAT Program Components

From the vantage point of artists and presenters participating in this evaluation, PennPAT’s cornerstone program components are: financial support, the artist roster, community engagement, and its portfolio of technical assistance and support services.

Predictably, input and data collected about all program components were predominately positive. As the economy has fluctuated some PennPAT programs and services have been curtailed, yet essential components have remained. This can be attributed to MAAF and Funding Partner rigor to regularly evaluate and continually fine-tune the program anticipating future opportunities and challenges, and striving to keep PennPAT relevant. In the statistical summary of empirical data measuring the effectiveness of program components, both from artists and presenters, rarely were any ratings less than "excellent" or "good." Only when pressed during focus groups and interviews did program participants offer constructive criticism and ideas for modifications that might improve the ecology of touring.

1. PennPAT financial support—Fee Support Grants, New Directions Grants, Technical Assistance Grants, and Strategic Opportunity Grants—have been the most highly valued PennPAT components.

| Total PennPAT Grants & Reimbursements from inception through June 30, 2012 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                                  | # presenters impacted | # artists impacted | # activities     |
| Fee Support Grants                               | 578              | 207               | 2,076 engagements |
| New Directions Grants                             | 23               | 24                | 38 engagements    |
| Strategic Opportunity Grants                      | -                | 25                | 30 engagements    |
| Technical Assistance Grants                       | -                | 168               | 539 projects      |
| Artist Reimbursement Grants                       | -                | 132               | 215 trips         |
| Presenter Travel Grants                           | 57               | 70+               | 65 trips          |

What the data revealed:
- When roster artists were asked to prioritize the top three aspects of PennPAT most important to them, fee support for engagements outside of Pennsylvania was ranked most important at 77%;
- Rated second highest among artists’ priorities—at 60%—was fee support for Pennsylvania engagements. Also at 60% were PennPAT’s technical assistance to enhance marketing;

PennPAT has been very supportive of our career development over the years. Without grants for technical assistance, we would not have been able to present the same quality of materials, website, and recordings with a creative and progressive edge to market ourselves. As a result of this support, we have been able to focus more on our artistry and elevate our positions in the industry to perform in better venues in line with PennPAT’s values and standards.

PennPAT Roster Ensemble
- 89% of the roster artists participating in the survey rated the variety of PennPAT fee support opportunities from good to excellent;

- 79% of presenters attribute access to high quality performances for their communities to PennPAT;

- Almost half (49%) of PennPAT presenters would not likely continue booking roster artists they have presented without fee support.

**What roster artists said:**

- *PennPAT took us to the Kennedy Center for a twelve show gig. It was a defining moment in our evolution. The Kennedy Center hired us back in the next year independently of PennPAT.*

- *Thanks to PennPAT’s support, we’ve been able to build on our grassroots support in NYC and lay the groundwork for the same kind of support in DC and, as a result, we’re touring to both locations in 2012-2013.*

- *Being from Erie, PennPAT helped me connect to the entire state. There is foundation support for artists living in Philly and Pittsburgh but nothing like that for Erie. PennPAT helped me be a part of a larger performing/presenting community.*

- *PennPAT travel grants were instrumental in our being able to participate in several major festivals and events including the Winnipeg Folk Festival.*

Emily Pinkerton
What PennPAT Presenters\textsuperscript{2} said:

- PennPAT provides us with funding to hire artists we would not otherwise be able to hire. And these are incredibly talented artists. We are in a small, rural community where corporate and business support is very limited. Though we seek and receive underwriting for our concert series, the fee support is simply something we cannot get from another source. PennPAT has been a tremendous factor in our growth in our first 10 years of life and helped us become known for presenting some incredible artists.

- There are so many examples of PennPAT artists who have had an impact over the years that it is hard to single out any one artist. But I can say, in particular, the New Directions program allowed us to explore the creation of new work with artists like Dance Alloy and Leah Stein Dance Company, just incredible presenting and community engagement endeavors.

- For organizations in rural areas of the U.S. northeast, opportunities for funding high quality artists are extremely limited. Communities are often poor with no local or regional foundations or corporations to turn to for funding ... For some groups and some communities, PennPAT artists may be the only artists they can afford to bring from outside their immediate area ... PennPAT has made it possible for rural audiences to experience the diversity of American Culture despite their location outside the cultural mainstream.

\textsuperscript{2} For the purposes of this study, PennPAT presenters are those organizations that have benefitted in some way from a PennPAT grant or program.

Dan Kamin
Since program inception 296 artists have been on the roster. This map illustrates the ZIP code areas where roster artists have lived over the course of the program. There are 12 ZIP codes around Philadelphia and Pittsburgh where more than five roster artists had lived; 38 ZIP codes where 2-5 roster artists have lived, and 85 ZIP codes where one roster artist has lived. Each year, with annual assessment of the roster, numbers of artists on the roster have ranged between a low of 78 artists (in 1998) and a high of 160 (in 2009). The average number of artists on the roster per year has been 123.
2. PennPAT’s artist roster

Inclusion on PennPAT’s artist roster is a coveted distinction for touring artists and an imprimatur that guides presenters.

What the data revealed:

- 92% of roster artists agree that the PennPAT roster designation is a mark of excellence;
- 67% of presenters regularly rely on the PennPAT roster as a trusted resource when booking their seasons;
- Presenters believe the roster’s rigorous selection criteria have been a guarantee that these artists would be tour-ready, excellent in their craft, and skilled in effective community engagement;
- Non-PennPAT presenters and PennPAT presenters in focus groups shared that PennPAT’s roster is respected and carries high credibility across the US;
- Non-PennPAT presenters told us they have used the PennPAT roster as a trusted resource for booking. 45% of non-PennPAT presenters reported a high to very high reliance on artists’ rosters, and 30% reported their reliance on rosters as moderate.

What roster artists said:
- The imprimatur of the roster has increased our visibility and credibility, helping us to secure PennPAT-funded engagements as well as other engagements.

What PennPAT presenters said:
- PennPAT is essential to our success as a presenter in terms of both the showcase of artists and the high quality, diverse talent of the roster.
- I use the roster. When we first started our relationship with PennPAT, I was married to the booklet! I love the online roster. I use it all the time. One of our goals is to bring a diversity of the arts to our audiences, and the roster is a great planning tool especially for theater, children’s programs, and dance ... when my budget allows for touring versus a run out I love the fact that you can go on the website and get so much information ... I hope whatever happens ... there would be a way to keep the investment of that roster!
- I know artists on the roster have cleared many hurdles to get there. If I find an artist that is not on the roster, my first question to them is “why?” And my next statement is, “Well, when you get on the roster let me know.” That’s not saying that everyone on the roster is high caliber or the type of artist I want, but I know that they’ve gone through training and are prepared to tour.
- Our community knows that when a concert is a PennPAT artist, it is a guarantee of a top quality performance. The PennPAT roster artists are, without fail, amazingly talented and extremely personable.
What non-PennPAT presenters said:
- Not many of the artists fit our profile.
- Though I have a good opinion of the PennPAT program, I have not applied for PennPAT funding for a number of years. None of the PennPAT artists were compatible with our programming.

3. Community engagement is a highly valued component of PennPAT. It has helped presenters provide unique in-depth experiences, expand audiences, and grow partnerships. It has encouraged roster artists to stretch, keep their offerings relevant, and better connect their art to the communities in which they perform.

What the data revealed:
- More than half of roster artists and more than 60% of PennPAT presenters rated community engagement as a high program priority;
- 83% of roster artists rated community engagement as essential to PennPAT (the second highest of the seven highest impacts tested);
- 83% of PennPAT presenters reported that PennPAT engagements have allowed them to connect with their community in meaningful ways, and more than half (56%) of presenters that have received Fee Support Grants compared the quality of community engagement for PennPAT as better than other engagements;
- Support for community engagement comes not only from PennPAT but from PennPAT presenters and communities served by PennPAT roster artists. More than a third of responding artists rated support of community engagement from presenters and community members as excellent, and another 40% rated it as good.

What roster artists said:
- The community engagement aspect of PennPAT is phenomenal. You get people involved in actually experiencing the arts firsthand and getting involved. I do a lot of interactive things for people of all ages. It’s a huge thing for me artistically.
- Our company had an opportunity to set up our circus tent in Delaware where there isn’t a theatre. Over 10,000 children had a chance to experience our fusion of circus and theatre and a year later the president sent me a letter sharing that local children had started their own theatre troupe inspired by our work.
- I now conceive of my time in a community, including my residency activities, as a single performance piece that enables me to play a valuable role in that community, far beyond simply doing one show in a theatre.

What PennPAT presenters said:
- One of the best parts of PennPAT funded bookings is that some aspect of community engagement is required. It takes the arts and artists to populations that might not otherwise have or be able to AFFORD those experiences and allows educators to engage as well.
- Our venue partner in West Virginia would never be able to bring in dance without PennPAT. These rural communities and populations would not otherwise have that opportunity.
4. **PennPAT’s comprehensive portfolio of technical assistance, marketing support, and guidance has been integral to its success.** In focus groups, roster artists spoke of PennPAT training as their “arts academy,” where they have learned many vital skills from a variety of people through diverse platforms. In the research, there was a significant positive correlation between artists’ improved effectiveness in working with presenters and the depth of engagement they have had with PennPAT. The more workshops, showcases, and grants in which roster artists have participated, the higher, on average, the impact on their effectiveness in working with presenters. PennPAT’s marketing to promote roster artists, has been highly valued by roster artists and presenters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total portfolio of technical assistance services since the program’s inception through June 30, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong># impacted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Showcases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development Workshops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roster Application workshops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artists’ Retreats</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PennPAT representation at booking conferences</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What the data revealed:**

- In roster artists’ evaluation of PennPAT marketing assistance and services, no element was rated less than 4 on a 5-point scale, with 5 being the highest rating;

  - 74% of roster artists agree that technical assistance is critical to their success in touring.
  - 90% of PennPAT presenters believe PennPAT artists are well prepared to be tour-ready and work effectively with them and their technical teams;

---

$^3$ Represents total number of participants – not unique individuals

$^4$ Ibid.
What roster artists said:
- Support and training services value cannot be overstated. The business of touring is very tough. Fee support might have enabled that first gig, but it is technical support and training that have prepared us to be tour-ready and likely the reason many of us are invited back. Whatever future iteration the program may take, continuous technical support services should be factored in because we’ve seen first-hand that is what sets this program apart from all others.

- As someone coming from another country, in addition to giving me legitimacy I would never have been able to achieve on my own, it taught me the business of touring. My life as an artist was able to continue in this country because of PennPAT counsel, advice, and instruction I’ve received.

- PennPAT has helped me as an independent artist maintain the level of professionalism that has enabled me to compete in the worldwide jazz arena. The quality of my website, promotional materials, and recordings has garnered worldwide recognition and even two Grammy nominations. I owe much of my success to PennPAT.

What non-PennPAT presenters said:
- I know PennPAT artists have cleared many hurdles to get there and I know that they’ve gone through training and are prepared to tour.
Artists’ Impact Summary

This chart summarizes roster artists’ perceptions of PennPAT and how it has impacted their careers. 48% of responses were rated 4 or higher. Of 108 potential impacts, none were rated negatively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale: 5=Highly Positive, 4=Somewhat Positive, 3=No Apparent Impact, 2=Somewhat Negative, 1=Highly Negative</th>
<th>Artists with Fee Supported Engagements (n=86)</th>
<th>Artists with New Directions Grant Supported Engagements (n=9)</th>
<th>Artists with Technical Assistance Grants (n=92)</th>
<th>Artists with Strategic Opportunity Grants (n=17)</th>
<th>Artists with Presenter Attendance Through Travel Grant (n=21)</th>
<th>Artists Participating in Showcases (n=101)</th>
<th>Artists Participating in Workshops (n=76)</th>
<th>Website Resources (All Roster Artists) (n=120)</th>
<th>PennPAT Program Marketing (All Roster Artists) (n=128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of engagements in Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of engagements in PennPAT service area (outside of PA)</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of engagements elsewhere (outside of PennPAT service area)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of repeat engagements with presenters</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of engagements with new presenters</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/knowledge of the touring business</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved working relationships with presenters</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better/higher quality venues</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed experience with community engagement</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative development</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased touring income</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial stability</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Positive Impacts on PennPAT Presenters

This series of charts summarizes to what extent program components impacted PennPAT presenters most highly and how.

- Financial stability
- Ticket sales/revenue
- Ability to create new or to expand community partnerships
- Access to high quality performances for your community
- Working relationships with PennPAT Roster Artists
- Number of engagements with PennPAT artists new to your community.
- Number of repeat engagements with PennPAT Artists
- Number of engagements with PennPAT Roster Artists

- Program Marketing (n=126-143 varied)
- PennPAT Travel Grants (n=22)
- PennPAT Showcases (n=66)
- New Directions Grants (n=10)
- Fee Support Grants (n=136)
Section Two: PennPAT Artists

A. Impacts of Geography, Artist Discipline, and Race

Learning what is important to touring artists in today’s environment, and how PennPAT could be more proactive and responsive in addressing these factors was one purpose of this study. In striving to better understand what influenced PennPAT impacts on artists, the analysis considered additional factors: With Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and the four Funding Partners it was determined to further investigate the artist data using three lenses: geography, artist discipline, and race. In this section of the report, we provide the results of the thorough investigation of each of PennPAT’s program components to determine the variances and alignments. The report flags significant variances and provides supporting statistical evidence. All of the data in this section, including additional related charts and graphs reproduced herein, can be found in the companion document to this evaluation report.

The utility of these insights should be instructive in the future for determining how finite resources can best be allocated and where. From artists’ different vantage points, which program components matter most? In what specific areas should additional attention be paid to ensure that a 21st century touring support delivery system is equally accessible to artists, regardless of geographic factors, artist discipline, or race?
By Geography
The first area of inquiry was geography. How did PennPAT impacts vary because of where artists live? Roster artists were divided into three geographic subsets: Philadelphia Region, Pittsburgh Region, and a third subset with artists from all other areas of the state combined called “Other PA Region.” It was important for report validity that the survey sample would be comparable to PennPAT’s roster universe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PennPAT Geographic Subsets</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Universe</th>
<th>Variance between PennPAT universe and survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Philadelphia Region</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pittsburgh Region</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other PA Region</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PennPAT Artist Geographic Profile

![Bar chart showing the comparison between the survey sample and PennPAT universe for different geographic regions.](chart.png)

- Philadelphia Region
- Other PA Region
- Pittsburgh Region

Report Survey Sample (n=143)
PennPAT Universe (n=296)
Overview: PennPAT offerings and impacts as seen through the lens of geography

This chart shows how roster artists from the report’s three geographic regions responded to seven statements about PennPAT program’s value to them. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being “strongly agree” and 1 being “strongly disagree,” 11 of 21 statements were rated 4 or higher and the balance were rated from 3.46 to 3.96. There were no statistically significant variances in how roster artists from different locations across the state responded to this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the PennPAT program overall?</th>
<th>Philadelphia Region</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Region</th>
<th>Other PA Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale: 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 3=No Opinion, 2=Somewhat Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being identified as a PennPAT Roster Artist is a mark of excellence that bolsters my/our credibility.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Connecting with communities is essential to the success of my/our PennPAT engagements.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation as a PennPAT Roster Artist has improved my effectiveness in working with presenters.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The technical assistance provided through PennPAT has been critical to my success in securing touring engagements.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunities to network with presenters through PennPAT events have expanded my/our touring.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PennPAT support for opportunities to tour out of state has been vital to my/our career development.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PennPAT engagements have had a significant impact on my/our ability to earn a living/stabilize our income.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this chart the importance to artists of nine PennPAT program components are sorted by roster artists’ geographic region from least to most important. Arrows point to the three areas where there was a difference of 15% or more between one artist group and another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Philadelphia Region Artists (n=82)</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Region Artists (n=27)</th>
<th>Other PA Region Artists (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development for tour-readiness</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel grants for presenters to see your performances</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement/activities in tandem with</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performances in communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase opportunities with presenters</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roster designation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance to enhance marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee support for Pennsylvania engagements</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee support for touring engagements outside of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Artists were asked to comment on touring engagement trends during their roster years. While the predominant finding is that artists’ touring engagements increased during roster years, from 25% to 33% of artists reported that activity was up and down with no real trend either way due to PennPAT. One substantial difference is reported in the extent to which touring remained steady during roster years, with Philadelphia artists responding at 21% and Pittsburgh artists responding at 4%.

**Trends in Touring Engagements by Artist Geography**

- **Philadelphia Region (n=82)**
  - Increases during roster years: 48%
  - Remains steady during roster years: 39%
  - Decreases during roster years: 4%
  - Up and down, no real trend either way due to PennPAT: 0%
  - Not sure: 11%

- **Pittsburgh Region (n=27)**
  - Increases during roster years: 50%
  - Remains steady during roster years: 9%
  - Decreases during roster years: 7%
  - Up and down, no real trend either way due to PennPAT: 33%
  - Not sure: 7%

- **Other PA Region (n=32)**
  - Increases during roster years: 21%
  - Remains steady during roster years: 7%
  - Decreases during roster years: 9%
  - Up and down, no real trend either way due to PennPAT: 25%
  - Not sure: 6%
By Artist Discipline

Artist discipline was the second query to test for similarities and differences in program impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PennPAT Artist Discipline Subsets</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Universe</th>
<th>Variance between PennPAT Universe and Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Dance</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Music</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Theater</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>296</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PennPAT Artist Profile by Artistic Discipline**

- **Music**
  - Report Survey Sample (n=143)
  - PennPAT Universe (n=296)

- **Dance**
  - Report Survey Sample (n=143)
  - PennPAT Universe (n=296)

- **Theater**
  - Report Survey Sample (n=143)
  - PennPAT Universe (n=296)
Overview: PennPAT offerings and impacts as seen through the lens of artist discipline

This comparative chart shows how roster artists responded to seven statements about the PennPAT program’s value to them as a dancer, musician, or theater artist. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being “strongly agree” and 1 being “strongly disagree,” 15 of 21 responses were rated 4 or higher and 10 were rated from 3.56 to 3.93. No response was rated lower than 3.56. Only in question 6 was there a significant variance in how roster artists in different artistic disciplines responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Theater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being identified as a PennPAT Roster Artist is a mark of excellence that bolsters my/our credibility.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Connecting with communities is essential to the success of my/our PennPAT engagements.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation as a PennPAT Roster Artist has improved my effectiveness in working with presenters.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The technical assistance provided through PennPAT has been critical to my success in securing touring engagements.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunities to network with presenters through PennPAT events have expanded my/our touring.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PennPAT support for opportunities to tour out of state has been vital to my/our career development.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PennPAT engagements have had a significant impact on my/our ability to earn a living/stabilize our income.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the chart arrows point to the three areas where there was a difference of 15% or more for top priorities by artistic discipline.

Top Program Priorities by Artist Discipline

- Professional development for tour-readiness: Dance (10%), Music (8%), Theater (27%)
- Networking opportunities: Dance (10%), Music (9%), Theater (15%)
- Travel grants for presenters to see your performances: Dance (11%), Music (18%), Theater (23%)
- Community engagement/activities in tandem with performances in communities: Dance (13%), Music (18%), Theater (18%)
- Showcase opportunities with presenters: Dance (14%), Music (21%), Theater (20%)
- Roster designation: Dance (26%), Music (32%), Theater (33%)
- Technical assistance to enhance marketing: Dance (50%), Music (61%), Theater (63%)
- Fee support for Pennsylvania engagements: Dance (37%), Music (65%), Theater (68%)
- Fee support for touring engagements outside of Pennsylvania: Dance (64%), Music (75%), Theater (90%)

Legend: Dance (n=30) | Music (n=89) | Theater (n=22)
When artists were asked to comment on touring engagement trends during their roster years, the only substantial difference reported by artistic discipline is the extent to which touring remained steady during roster years, with 7% of dancers responding compared with 23% of theater artists.
Most discipline-related comments were about dance and received from presenters.

- **PennPAT has been so supportive to us, especially in the world of dance. Without their support, we would not be able to offer many of the dance workshops and performances that happen here as part of our summer program.**

- **We need PennPAT grants at our non-profit to help us bring professional dancers to our community. We can’t afford them alone.**

- **Hamilton College is part of the Mohawk Valley Dance Partnership, which combines forces with two other presenting organizations to bring a dance company to the area each year for a half-week residency that includes two school performances (for primarily inner city youth), master classes at two local studios, and an evening performance. This partnership is a fantastic way to build community relationships and bring new audiences into the theater. It is funded by the New York State DanceForce, which gives funding to each member organization every year. The guidelines of membership are that each organization must rotate off every fifth year to preserve funding for another organization. Funding from DanceForce is crucial to the partnership and dance performance. In 2009 Hamilton College rotated off. Thanks to PennPAT, we were able to preserve the partnership and present Philadanco. Without PennPAT, there would have been no dance residency that year.**

- **There are so many examples of PennPAT artists who have had an impact over the years it is hard to single out any one artist—but I can say in particular the New Directions program allowed us to explore the creation of new work with artists like Dance Alloy and Leah Stein Dance Company which were incredible presenting and community engagement endeavors.**

- **Modern dance is very important to our audiences as we have an excellent training school; however it is difficult for me to book touring dance companies due to cost and technical requirements. PennPAT has allowed me to book Koresh Dance for this season and add some wonderful community outreach.**

- **PennPAT helped us bring dancers to perform in our Spring Festival and teach modern dance to a range of dancers—many who had never had modern classes before. The dancers broke up the students into 2 groups so that each group received individual attention and the dancers loved that. The audience loved watching the dance company perform—so 2 key community groups were served well with the PennPAT grant.**

- **Our university in general doesn’t provide a lot of cultural programming. We have a department of arts and culture but there’s not a focus on performing arts, so I really have to work for funding to fulfill our mission, which is to bring performing arts—particularly dance and music—to campus. Out of the university cultural committee I only get about $10,000 a year so I need to go to PennPAT. I look specifically at their roster artists because I can apply for funding to bring them here. Because the drive from Philadelphia to New Jersey is close, PennPAT allows me to do the kind of programming I want to do.**
By Race

The final sort to test variances in response was by race. PennPAT’s universe of 296 roster artists since its inception has been comprised of six racial subsets. Again, the survey universe nearly proportionally represents PennPAT with one exception: White/Caucasian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PennPAT Racial Subsets</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
<th>PennPAT Universe</th>
<th>Survey Universe</th>
<th>Variance between PennPAT Universe and Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. White/Caucasian</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>+11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Black/African American</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Multi-Racial **</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Multi-Racial: no more than 50% of the group members are from one racial category.
Overview: PennPAT offerings and impacts as seen through the lens of race

This comparative chart shows how roster artists from PennPAT’s six racial subsets responded to seven statements about the program’s value to them. On a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being “strongly agree” and 1 being “strongly disagree.” Nine of 42 responses were rated 5, 21 were rated between 4 and 4.69, 8 were rated between 3 and 3.9, and 2 were rated at 1. The mean scores differ by race, but the samples are far too small to determine their significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the PennPAT program overall?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale:</strong> 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Somewhat Agree, 3=No Opinion, 2=Somewhat Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being identified as a PennPAT Roster Artist is a mark of excellence that bolsters my/our credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Connecting with communities is essential to the success of my/our PennPAT engagements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation as a PennPAT Roster Artist has improved my effectiveness in working with presenters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The technical assistance provided through PennPAT has been critical to my success in securing touring engagements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunities to network with presenters through PennPAT events have expanded my/our touring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. PennPAT support for opportunities to tour out of state has been vital to my/our career development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PennPAT engagements have had a significant impact on my/our ability to earn a living/stabilize our income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the chart below nine PennPAT program components are sorted by roster artists’ race from least to most important.

### Priorities by Race

- **Professional development for tour-readiness**
- **Networking opportunities**
- **Travel grants for presenters to see your performances**
- **Community engagement/activities in tandem with performances in communities**
- **Showcase opportunities with presenters**
- **Roster designation**
- **Technical assistance to enhance marketing**
- **Fee support for Pennsylvania engagements**
- **Fee support for touring engagements outside of Pennsylvania**

Legend:
- Native American (n=1)
- Multi-Racial (n=13)
- Hispanic/Latino (n=4)
- Caucasian/White (n=97)
- Black/African American (n=25)
- Asian/Pacific Islander (1)
B. Overview of PennPAT Artists’ Insights and Perceptions

In addition to impacts already highlighted, the research produced substantial amounts of data illuminating the “whys” behind PennPAT. The stories shared by those who experienced, created, and have lived with PennPAT further define the meaning and value of the program beyond the statistics.

PennPAT has affected roster artists’ career development, inspiration, and artistry.
Roster artists spoke about the competitiveness of the roster selection process and the rigor required to remain on it. Many shared how PennPAT’s high standards and expectations continually encouraged (and pushed) them to stretch and perfect their artistry, inspiring them to be better performers.

What the data revealed:

- 69% of roster artists who responded to the survey reported how vital support for out-of-state touring has been to their creative development. Because of the requirement of fee support grants that roster artists work more closely with their presenters, nearly half (49%) told us their creative development was fueled to a greater extent through PennPAT engagements than other engagements;

- With PennPAT there is a significant positive correlation between artists’ improved effectiveness in working with presenters and the depth of their engagement. The more workshops, showcases, and grants in which artists have participated, the higher, on average, the impact on their effectiveness.

What roster artists said:

- Our first showcase performance not only led to a contract, but was a great motivator for our group. It pushed us artistically in a way that our local performances and constituents did/do not.

- A New Directions grant, when the project involved going into the community, allowed me to stretch as an artist ... interviewing residents, then crafting and presenting the story of the town ... The fundamental value has been wider exposure; it has contributed to my continued growth as an artist and opportunities to interact with various populations in new communities.

PennPAT is perceived by some roster artists as their “arts academy” in which they have learned many vital skills from a variety of people through diverse platforms.
In interviews and focus groups artists shared that their experiences with PennPAT have taught them essential “left brain talents.” PennPAT workshops, retreats, and hands-on counsel have honed their ability to be entrepreneurs capable of managing their careers, their organizations, and “learning the ropes” about the presenting business so that working with presenters is easier and more productive—both for themselves and the communities where they are performing.

Marketing assistance was widely acknowledged: PennPAT has provided essential tools, expertise, and support for professional promotional materials roster artists said they would never have been able to afford or access on their own. Some attributed NOT needing a manager/agent to PennPAT because they learned to manage their own careers.

I have grown in my understanding of touring, marketing and—most of all—how to keep these in harmony with artistic vision.

Roster Artist
What the data revealed:

- 82% of responding artists reported that participation as a PennPAT Roster Artist improved their effectiveness in working with presenters;
- 69% of roster artists rated technical assistance to enhance marketing as a high PennPAT priority;
- 74% of responding roster artists said PennPAT technical assistance grants have been critical to their learning, business skills development, and contributed greatly to their success in securing touring engagements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety of Support Opportunities (n=131)</th>
<th>Relevance of Professional Development (n=127)</th>
<th>One-On-One Consultations (n=113)</th>
<th>Schedule of Professional Development (n=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What roster artists said:

- The program has been a blessing and is far more beneficial to us than our other roster memberships. The very first workshop I attended 15 years ago started me on the road to understanding the booking process from the eyes of the presenter. The workshop did role-playing of a presenter and an artist on the phone and I understood the presenter’s needs and pressures instead of my own. This was a big change from the self-centered artist to a collaborative colleague.

- Before I joined PennPAT, I was a mess! I had gobs of “touring materials” stored in my basement, but there was no hope of organizing them until the PennPAT roster application came along. In deciding to turn my full focus on touring as a solo artist and leader of my own ensembles, the simple act of gathering those materials was like GOLD to me ... Helping me to define myself through the organization process ... meeting presenters, obtaining a manager, and—most important—receiving and sustaining visibility in the social/business world of music/artistic endeavors.

- PennPAT’s insistence to see that we were marketing outside of our home area has been critical to our existence.

- The application process made me formalize a touring promotional kit that continues to be useful.

- One-on-one consultations with various people within the art world were so informative. Having the opportunity to attend and showcase at conferences was an invaluable experience, not only for the experience, but for the exposure to presenters. Attending the conferences and being able to
network face to face is critical to staying in the forefront of presenters' minds.

- Because of PennPAT support we have landed major management and have significantly improved our marketing materials and visibility among presenters.

- Technical support grants allowed us to complete at least one commercial recording and obtain high-quality professional photographs of the ensemble. These items have contributed significantly to our ability to secure touring engagements ... there's no question that our professional credibility and stature was enhanced by these marketing elements and that we might not have obtained these bookings without them.

- Most recently, I received a PennPAT technical assistance grant for marketing consultation and radio promotion. Following this work, my latest album reached #10 on the National Folk DJ charts, and I was selected to be part of juried showcases at two regional Folk Alliance conferences. After several showcases and several technical assistance grants from PennPAT in the last 3 years, I feel extremely well-prepared and satisfied with the tools (marketing, website, video, etc.) that now represent my songs and my musical identity.

- PennPAT's TA grant has helped the orchestra update its marketing materials and make the orchestra more competitive in the touring marketplace.

- We have benefitted greatly from grants for the design and production of much of our marketing materials (brochures, video, and website). We found professionals who created these marketing materials through PennPAT retreats.

- PennPAT has assisted me in producing high quality marketing materials, hire top publicists and radio promo personnel which supported the placement of my latest two CDs on the top 20 charts for Jazz and world music.

- PennPAT's technical assistance grants have been extremely valuable for me, allowing me to record several CDs of American piano music that have greatly increased my visibility and helped me create an identity. I have been able to hire a publicist to completely overhaul my marketing materials. I would have had great difficulty doing this without PennPAT's support. The publicist and all of her sub-contractors are Pennsylvania based, enabling me to generate economic activity in Pennsylvania as well as helping me personally.

- PennPAT helped fund a recording project of mine with the Volgograd Symphony in Russia. This CD was made of Russian Cello Concertos with an experienced Russian conductor and orchestra. The positive reviews that I received for the CD from Gramophone and Fanfare have served to solidify my touring possibilities!

- A PennPAT's technical assistance grant enabled PRISM to produce one of our most critically acclaimed recordings (Antiphony), which has attracted significant attention from the media and concert presenters. It was reviewed in Chamber Music magazine and discussed in a feature on PRISM in the Arts and Leisure section of The New York Times, among other publications. The grant was key to producing the recording, which serves our booking agent as a marketing tool to solicit engagements. The disc would not have been made without PennPAT's support.
In 2006 PennPAT enabled my Saxophone Choir to record live at the Blue Note Jazz Club in New York City. Guest soloists Michael Brecker, James Carter, and Joe Lovano performed.

The imprimatur of the roster has increased the visibility and credibility of PennPAT artists, helping them to secure both PennPAT-funded as well as other engagements.

What the data revealed:
- Overall, 92% of responding roster artists reported that being identified as a PennPAT Roster Artist is a mark of excellence that bolsters their credibility;
- 63% of responding artists rated roster designation as a high priority for the program. However, when forced to pick three top aspects of the PennPAT program that were most important to them, roster designation ranked fourth out of nine choices, outranked by fee-support grants both in and out of Pennsylvania and technical assistance grants;
What roster artists said:

- It may be odd to put it this way but getting onto the PennPAT roster is what convinced us that we really are professionals. The PennPAT “stamp of approval” has bolstered our confidence and played a major role in our lives. The prestige of being on PennPAT definitely turns heads.

- People don’t really want to take a chance on an artist they’ve never heard of. We are an ensemble of six so it is not inexpensive to hire us. PennPAT is a mark of excellence and roster recognition opened many doors for us.

- PennPAT’s designation of me as a roster artist for the first solo show I ever created gave me confidence to continue growing as a solo performer. In recent years, I have performed outside the United States and in well-respected theatres and theatre festivals in the U.S.

- Being accepted onto the PennPAT Roster and working with PennPAT has dramatically transformed JUNK from a successful local company to a nationally recognized touring company.

- While we have not fully benefited from PennPAT touring grants, just being on the roster has raised the stature of our ensemble. Presenters seem to equate quality and professionalism of touring organizations with their listing on the roster.

- Since 2000, when listed with the PennPAT roster, the only negative aspect of my roster application was that “you don’t charge enough” which after 35 years of touring small festivals, folk clubs and schools, was so refreshing and encouraging to have professionals who I admire, comment positively on my career. PennPAT has been a “badge” that I have very proudly worn and I am thoroughly humbled to be a part of this organization.

- The selection as a PennPAT artist was an important recognition of my performance skills on a professional touring level, and continues to be a major keystone in my marketing. It was a pleasure to be taken seriously as a performer in respected venues far from home, both in good performance fees and venue hospitality.

- I was identified by two PA venues through the PennPAT roster book, however neither used PennPAT funding process to supplement my fee. Those who know what PennPAT is have great respect for the artists on the roster.

- Roster designation is a definite plus in proof to presenters of artistic/overall quality. Essentially an “approved stamp of quality” that has tremendously furthered our overall career.

- We’ve only been on the roster during this past year, but our appointment to the roster has definitely lent credibility to our ensemble. PennPAT is recognized for a certain standard of excellence and by being roster members we are getting more notice from people—both presenters and colleagues.

- We were invited to participate in the World Dance Alliance Conference several years ago because they found us on the PennPAT website. This event was something I never would have had knowledge about and allowed me to view our work within the much larger international dance community.
PennPAT has impacted some artists’ decisions to live in Pennsylvania.

What the data revealed:
- A number of roster artists relocated to Pennsylvania because of PennPAT: 14% of responding roster artists [20 artists] indicated that they had at some point relocated to Pennsylvania from another state. Of those relocating artists, 14 artists indicated that PennPAT influenced their decision to move to Pennsylvania and 13 artists reported that they are likely to consider moving out of the state if grants are no longer available to support Pennsylvania touring artists.

What roster artists said:
- I lived in New York and met some PennPAT reps a few years ago in Ohio. That’s when I first heard about PennPAT. I was very impressed with the organization. It was very unusual at this conference to see this group of people that seemed to support each other, they had this relationship that was obviously unique. I walked over to the group and they told me about PennPAT artists and that you had to live in Pennsylvania to be one. I literally moved to Pennsylvania. I planned after that meeting to move to the state and apply to be on that roster. I was so impressed with this organization that cared about supporting artists. I had not experienced such a thing. So I moved and applied and got accepted my first time. It validated to me that I had something of quality in my work. I was very, very proud to be placed on the PennPAT roster.

- PennPAT required me to reregister my non-profit to PA. Given that PennPAT is closing, I am sorry I made the move.

- I’ve decided to stay in Pennsylvania because of PennPAT.

We will not move out of state. During the years we have seen the changes in the reputation of arts organizations from PA and especially from Philadelphia. Philadelphia became one, if not the best, city for artists to live in and be productive and grow. PA and Philadelphia became much respected in the national scene for the visibility and quality of their artists and it will be very sad to see it changing.
PennPAT has been a means for securing greater artist exposure and touring opportunity. PennPAT engagements and support services have been a springboard for many roster artists to expand touring opportunity.

What the data revealed:

- 81% rated fee support for touring engagements outside of Pennsylvania as a high program priority;
- 73% of roster artists reported that opportunities to network with presenters through PennPAT events have expanded their touring;
- The majority of responding roster artists claimed that roster designation had a positive impact on the number of touring engagements they experienced, including new geographic areas:
  - 73% of roster artists reported positive impact in the number of engagements in Pennsylvania;
  - 71% of roster artists reported positive impact in the number of engagements outside of Pennsylvania in the mid-Atlantic area;
  - 42% of roster artists reported positive impact in engagements outside of the mid-Atlantic area.
- 69% of roster artists reported that support for out-of-state touring has been vital to the development of their careers;
- Repeat engagements have been attributed to PennPAT:
  - 63% of roster artists benefitting from Fee Support Grants reported positive impact on their number of repeat engagements with presenters;
  - 67% of roster artists benefitting from New Directions Grant reported positive impact on their number of repeat engagements with presenters;
  - 64% of roster artists who have received Technical Assistance Grants reported positive impact on their number of repeat engagements with presenters.
- 75% of responding roster artists rated the viability of multi-state touring as good to excellent.

What roster artists said:

- Prior to PennPAT, I performed in many venues that were less than ideal—clubs and bars that did not really care about music. PennPAT has opened the door to Performing Arts Centers and Theaters. Those venues are the proper place for my music, and they draw the proper audience that I wish to reach. It has been most fulfilling to make this change—PROGRESS.
- Our tours to VA Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond VA and Lynchburg VA Community Concert Association in 1999 & 2001 provided us the ideal concert performance and community outreach activities for Spoken Hand. We worked with nearby colleges and community cultural centers reaching many folks who were literally waiting for us to share our skills and passion with them. From dance classes to "drums, not guns" ensemble plus several more organizations, we felt a strong sense of gratification in touching so many lives.
- PennPAT made it possible for us to tour to St Ann's Warehouse last spring in NYC. This was a vital step in the touring life for our show Elephant Room. We would not have had this opportunity without PennPAT support, definitely.
- I was able to conduct a one-year project of four seasonal performances at a New York City art center. It would not have been possible without PennPAT support.

- PennPAT has sponsored both Pig Iron's highest-profile engagement to date—at Under the Radar in NYC in January 2010—and its most highly-attended engagement, as part of the season at the Woolly Mammoth Theatre Company in 2009. Thanks to PennPAT's support, we've been able to build on our grassroots support in NYC and lay the groundwork for the same kind of support in DC, and as a result we're touring to both locations in 2012-2013.

- We have on-going relationships with many thru Katie. We can bend the ear of former NEA, APAP head Mario Garcia-Durham because of a PennPAT retreat picnic. Over the course of 30 official regional conferences and much time and cost, we have not had some of the opportunities for authenticity and intimacy that PennPAT has afforded us. I don't think in retrospect we would have represented Pittsburgh original contemporary arts without PennPAT—at least, not this long and this loud.

- It has been of most value with larger touring projects (short residencies) that the presenters could not have afforded without PennPAT support. A good example would be what should have been a one-concert tour. With PennPAT support, it turned into a four-trip residency spread over three months with an area school district, which attracted yet another grant from a private foundation to generate one of our largest touring projects ever.

PennPAT's impact on establishing relationship-building with new presenters.

What the data revealed:
- Roster artists reported that Fee Support Grants, Presenter Travel Grants, and Artist Technical Assistance Grants have had the most positive impact on their number of new presenter engagements when compared with other PennPAT programs and services used:
  - 88% reported that Fee Support Grants have had a positive impact on the number of new presenter engagements they experienced throughout their careers;
  - 77% reported that their work has been seen live through the support of PennPAT Presenter Travel Grants.

Roster artists credit PennPAT with performance opportunities in better venues.

What the data revealed:
- 84% of roster artists reported that Fee Support Grants had the most positive impact on their ability to secure engagements in higher-quality venues compared with other PennPAT programs and services used.
- 77% of roster artists indicated New Directions grants as the most impactful in this area.
- 71% of roster artists said Technical Assistance Grants had the most positive impact in helping them secure high quality venues.
Showcases, marketing, and website resources also have impacted roster artists’ increased touring opportunity.
There is a significant positive correlation between the number of showcases and workshops artists have participated in and how positively they rate PennPAT technical assistance services and networking opportunities on their careers; the more PennPAT opportunities they took advantage of, on average, the stronger the positive impact on their career.

Of the roster artists who participated in PennPAT showcases:
- 72% reported their number of Pennsylvania engagements increased;
- 63% reported securing higher quality venues;
- 64% reported an increase in the number of engagements booked in the PennPAT funding region;
- 39% reported an increase in the number of engagements outside the PennPAT funding region.

PennPAT marketing has had a positive impact on roster artists ability to secure more engagements:
- 62% reported positive impacts on the number of engagements in Pennsylvania;
- 59% reported positive impacts on the number of engagements in the PennPAT funding region;
- 44%, reported increased engagements outside the PennPAT funding region;
- 59% reported increased engagements with new presenters.

PennPAT website resources have had a positive impact on the number of engagements roster artists have booked:
- 60% reported positive impacts on the number of engagements in Pennsylvania;
- 56% reported increased engagements with new presenters and with the number of engagements in the PennPAT funding region;
- 44% reported increased engagements outside the PennPAT funding region.

PennPAT has enabled international opportunities.
PennPAT has enabled roster artists to tour in 31 countries in five continents.

What roster artists said:
- In the past few years, PennPAT Technical Support grants have allowed us to work with top-of-the-line photographers twice to revamp the image of both our chamber group and our orchestra. Those photos have been essential to all of our marketing and helped us to land two tours to Germany. A PennPAT Strategic Opportunities grant helped with the cost of transporting our entire orchestra to Europe in order to perform the second of those two tours, and that tour has greatly boosted the prestige and renown of our ensemble.
- PennPAT travel grants were instrumental in our being able to participate in several major festivals and events from 2005-2007 including the Winnipeg Folk Festival.
- PennPAT gave us the opportunity to travel to Ecuador and do a residency and festival concert. It was an extraordinary opportunity and experience.
Most recently, PennPAT is making it possible for me to complete a concert tour to Hanoi. This engagement is both a result of a previous PennPAT-supported Asian tour, but it is likely to lead to additional engagements in the future, being an important building block in the critical mass of my Asian engagements that encourages presenters in that part of the world to consider hiring me.

PennPAT has helped build community connections for roster artists and their presenters.

Some artists (roster artists and non-roster artists) believe PennPAT provides strong social value through encouraging community engagement activities. This is particularly true for engagements that connect with underserved, special needs, or marginalized populations. Racially-specific roster artists credit
PennPAT community engagement as a way to build a greater understanding and appreciation of their culture.

What the data revealed:

- 83% of roster artists reported that connecting with communities is essential to the success of their PennPAT engagements;

- Support for community engagement comes not only from PennPAT, but from PennPAT presenters and their communities. More than a third of responding roster artists rated support of community-engagement from presenters and community members as excellent, and another 40% rated it as good;

- Roster artists benefiting from PennPAT grants ranked the value of their community engagement experience as positive from those grants as follows:
  - 89% New Directions Grants
  - 83% Fee Support Grants
  - 62% Presenter Travel Grants

What roster artists said:

- At a time when classical music is a musical language unknown to many presenters, PennPAT has helped enormously with the career of pianist Leon Bates. ... a small community in Maryland did not have the resources to bring in an artist of Bates’ caliber. Not only was the concert a huge success but the residency was particularly important to younger children in the community. Bates captivated them with his music and his knowledge of sports, his promotion of reading, and his urging all to study an instrument.

- Our company had an opportunity to set up our circus tent in Delaware where there isn’t a theatre. Over 10,000 children had a chance to experience our fusion of circus and theatre and a year later the president sent me a letter sharing that local children had started their own theatre troupe inspired by our work.

- I now conceive of my time in a community, including my residency activities, as a single performance piece that enables me to play a valuable role in that community, far beyond simply doing one show in a theatre. At Gallaudet University, the school for the deaf in Washington, DC during a weeklong residency I performed for deaf students both on and off the campus and in several public schools. Now THAT’S community engagement.
PennPAT has impacted the financial stability of roster artists.

What the data revealed:
The larger the percentage of annual income derived from touring in general, the larger the percentage of that touring income PennPAT is likely to account for, on average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Income From Touring</th>
<th>Less than 25%</th>
<th>25%-49%</th>
<th>50%-74%</th>
<th>75%-99%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
<td>(n=26)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%-49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-74%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%-99%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Of 10 characteristics of engagements tested (e.g. community-engagement, quality of venue, technical support, incomes, audience response, etc.), on average, income scored the highest of all;
- 67% of responding artists reported that PennPAT engagements have had a significant impact on their ability to earn a living or stabilize their income;
- 41% of roster artists reported that 50% or more of their overall performance income comes from touring (PennPAT and other sources);
- In addition to seeing trends in increased income during roster years, 19% of roster artists reported that PennPAT has accounted for 50% or more of their overall touring income;
- When comparing income from PennPAT-funded engagements to other engagements, PennPAT-funded engagements, on average, were rated better;
There is a significant positive correlation between the significance of PennPAT engagements on artists’ ability to earn a living and the number of years they have been on the roster; on average, the more positive the impact on their ability to earn a living, the longer they have been on the roster;

Roster artists who have benefited from New Directions Grants, Fee Support Grants, and Presenter Travel Grants reported the most positive impact on increased touring income and financial stability:
- 89% of roster artists who have benefited from New Directions Grants reported positive impact on increased touring income, and 78% reported positive impacts on financial stability;
- 88% reported positive impact on increased touring income from Fee Support grants, and 73% reported positive impact on financial stability;
- 72% of roster artists reported positive impact on increased touring from Presenter Travel Grants, and 67% reported impacts on financial stability.

What roster artists said:
- The financial support from PennPAT has allowed us to earn enough income to make a living as musicians.
- PennPAT grants have made it possible for me to perform with Orchestras outside Pennsylvania and get good fees. PennPAT has made educational lectures at schools possible.
- Creative relationships developed—because PennPAT set up the situation where we could meet, because PennPAT established guidelines or a culture of "quality residencies", because PennPAT financially assisted us in doing the work.

And recently, because PennPAT won’t fund the same thing year after year and we had to go silent for a year—that worked against us—when Touchstone received the NEA grant to tour Shakespeare, the excellent relationship we had built with Judy and Adams County made it possible to manage quality touring around that initiative as well. All growing from the work that PennPAT made possible.

PennPAT’s guidance and stewardship have made the difference between some roster artists thriving or not. This was not a question directly posed on the survey, in focus groups, or in interviews. Nonetheless, comments were offered.

What artists and agents said:
- The path of an artist in America over the past 15 years—as economic and legislative trends have pulled nearly all funding for the arts—is not for the faint of heart. I moved to Philadelphia in 2000. I and my fellow Philadelphia-based PennPAT artists have benefited greatly from fee support programs ... I cannot imagine what, and where, we would have been without this program and the platform it afforded us.
- While it has been very helpful having fee support for some of our performances, one of the best things that PennPAT provided for our orchestra was a grant to assist with a performance at a regional showcase. It would have been too expensive to get the orchestra there without that technical assistance grant, and the showcase resulted in two tours for us.
- We have been able to perform in smaller out of the way venues that could never have afforded us. Also some of the
larger venues have had us for return engagements due to the availability of funding.

- Every aspect of PennPAT has been very beneficial to every artist I represent. Without this program their lives would have been incredibly different. There are so many presenters who will ask me if there can be a clause in our letter of agreement that says if they don't get the funding they do not have to bring the artist in. I discourage that and I try to encourage presenters to find alternative funding. PennPAT funding is so important.
Section Three: PennPAT Presenters

**Impacts on PennPAT Presenter Grantees**

In the chart below is a summary of presenter grantee responses to PennPAT impact statements from highest to lowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Statements</th>
<th>PennPAT Roster Artists are Tour Ready (n=169)</th>
<th>PennPAT Roster Artists Work Effectively with Our Team (n=162)</th>
<th>PennPAT Engagements Allow Meaningful Connections with Community (n=163)</th>
<th>PennPAT Impacts Ability to Bring High Quality Artists (n=165)</th>
<th>PennPAT Networking Opportunities have Expanded our Offerings (n=152)</th>
<th>Turn Regularly to PennPAT Artist Roster for Bookings (n=160)</th>
<th>Booking PennPAT Roster Artists Would Continue Regardless of Fee Support (n=165)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In striving to further understand what influenced PennPAT impacts on presenters, beyond the comprehensive surveying reported herein, additional factors were also measured. With Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation and the four Funding Partners it was determined to further investigate the presenter data using four lenses: market type, university presenters compared to independent presenters, Pennsylvania presenters compared to out-of-state presenters, and budget size. There were minimal variances reported by presenters based on these factors. All data are included in the companion report.

As I work with colleagues around the country, this is a really good public relations, marketing status symbol for Pennsylvania. There is no other program like it.

PennPAT Presenter
### Trends of presenters over the past 15 years

**What the data revealed:**

- Some PennPAT presenters reported an upward trend over the past 15 years in the number of roster artists presented;
  - 7% reported a significant increase;
  - 16% reported an increase;
  - 16% have remained stable;
  - 44% reported that there is no trend—it varies by year;

- Fee Support Grants directly affect presenter trends:
  - 27% of presenters that have received Fee Support Grants reported an increase in the number of engagements compared to 5% of presenters that have not received PennPAT support;

- 59% of presenters that have received a Travel Grant to see a PennPAT artist live reported a positive impact on the number of PennPAT engagements overall; 55% reported hiring the artist as a result more than 50% of the time;

- Of all PennPAT presenters, 79% reported that PennPAT has had a significant impact on their ability to bring high quality performing artists to their communities;

- 49% of PennPAT presenters are not likely to hire PennPAT artists without fee support;

**PennPAT has enabled some presenters to take more risks in presenting—in some cases presenting artists unknown in their communities and in other cases diversifying their programming.**

---

**Priorities for Presenters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee support for Pennsylvania engagements</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee support for touring engagements outside of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement/activities in tandem with performances in communities</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist marketing support</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase opportunities with presenters</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel grants for presenters to see PennPAT Roster Artists</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What PennPAT presenters said:
- PennPAT has been the key reason why we have booked several groups in the past. It allowed us to reduce the financial risk and offer otherwise unknown artists or groups in our community that very often proved to satisfy our patron’s thirst for new, high-quality, live performance opportunities. These performances not only rounded out our season even more, but they helped our audiences grow and expand in their cultural experiences.

Only through Fee Support has it been possible for many presenters to bring in high quality artists, especially rural and small community presenters.

What PennPAT presenters said:
- Through PennPAT, our small, rural community has access to the diversity of artists who live and perform in the State of Pennsylvania. Without an organization like PennPAT we would have no idea how to discover these artists and would not be able to afford to book them.

- We are not a performing arts center, but instead a community art center that offers various programming including classes, exhibitions, outreach programs, etc. Despite this, we do book performers for certain events that we have throughout the year. PennPAT has been vital to our ability to do this.

- Over the years, we have presented 8 PennPAT artists. Most of the PennPAT artists have helped us to expand the breadth and diversity of artists in a culturally isolated community.

- When the Secrest Series booked Philadanco, we were nervous because we do not have a good venue for dance with the seating capacity a Secrest performance draws. Joan Myers Brown was easy to work with, accommodating to our setting yet without compromising her artistic needs and vision. Her dancers gave a master class that thrilled our few dance students. I could not have afforded this company without the PennPAT grant - and Ms. Brown was terrific.

PennPAT has been instrumental for some in developing repeated engagements and long-term relationships between artists and presenters.

What the data revealed:
- 90% of presenters reported that Fee Support Grants have had a positive impact on working relationships with PennPAT roster artists;
- When comparing the tour-readiness of PennPAT roster artists to their other engagements, 40% of presenters that have received Fee Support rate the quality of community engagement as being better;
- Overall, when comparing PennPAT-funded engagements with other engagements, presenters rated PennPAT engagements better.
- 59% of PennPAT presenters reported that opportunities to network with roster artists have expanded their performance offerings; and more so for university presenters, out-of-state presenters, presenters serving suburban and rural markets, and those with budgets between $250,000 and $499,000, although there is little difference in impact by presenter budget size or geography.
PennPAT enabled greater diversity of artists presented.

What PennPAT presenters said:
- PennPAT’s design allowed smaller venues to book together and to choose from a variety of price ranges that included a variety of artists.

- We have been able to take artistic risks on more daring work because of the fee support grants. This work has allowed us to reach new audiences and expose existing audiences to something new.

- PennPAT artists have allowed us to maintain and in many cases expand our program offerings and expand the diversity of our overall season.

- In the years that we have presented PennPAT roster artists, audience response has been very positive, and we have typically been able to present residency programs to our local schools. PennPAT has helped us add good diversity to the types of programs we’ve offered.

The excellence of PennPAT engagements led some presenters to claim that the program elevated their own stature and reputation in the community, leveraged other resources, and improved their skills.

What PennPAT presenters said:
- Our community knows that when a concert is a PennPAT event, it is a guarantee of a top quality performance. The PennPAT roster artists are, without fail, amazingly talented and extremely personable, engaging the audience not only during the performance but also after the concert ... I can honestly say that we would not be the strong and vibrant Arts Center we have grown to be without PennPAT’s support. They were absolutely essential to our success.

- New Directions is such a great program ... It gives the artist something new ... and the presenter something to hang their hat on. I was part of a world premiere, and, as part of our letter of agreement, our names stay with that work forever. That is invaluable to me and to our university and our program. It’s also important for our students because they are involved in everything we do, so they see that process.

- PennPAT support has given us the opportunity to present incredible artists who we would have otherwise not been able to afford. Their support also helped us present such an eclectic line up each year, both in our evening series and our family series, at ticket prices our community could afford. The amazing PennPAT roster artists helped us establish our organization as a place where good things happen, where the performances are top notch.

- PennPAT has been great because they have introduced us to being accountable for doing more than just being a presenter. It really helped us think about how we program and how we then leverage those funds. We’ve been able to go out to corporate donors and show our PennPAT support, and our Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation or our Delaware support is on board. Now all of a sudden we have this cadre of partners. That has been tremendous for us.

- For us the impact of PennPAT is that we’ve been able to leverage our PennPAT funding. As a really young, grassroots organization to be able to put that logo right on our website and on our programs and people see that it’s sort of like the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. It’s not just about
going out and getting sponsors and single ticket buyers and subscriptions, it’s about the big picture here and current with our mission of bringing the arts for everyone to enjoy. The PennPAT grant made us accountable for these educational components and talk backs. We never did that before.

- My experience with the PennPAT roster artists we have booked is that they have gone out of their way to ensure a quality performance for our audience.

Community engagement is highly valued by PennPAT presenters. It provides unique in-depth experiences, expands audiences, and grows partnerships.

What the data revealed:
- Presenters rated community engagement as the third highest priority of PennPAT.
- 83% of roster artists reported that PennPAT engagements have allowed them to connect with their community in meaningful ways;
- University presenters and independent presenters differed in only one area: perceptions about community engagement by 16%. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Considered to be High Priorities of PennPAT Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 24% Independent Presenters: 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel grants for presenters to see PennPAT Roster Artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 27% Independent Presenters: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase opportunities with presenters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 38% Independent Presenters: 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist marketing support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 35% Independent Presenters: 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement/activities in tandem with performances in…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 57% Independent Presenters: 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee support for touring engagements outside of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 68% Independent Presenters: 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee support for Pennsylvania engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presenters: 68% Independent Presenters: 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What presenters said:

- The community component has challenged us to reach deeper into our community for new connections. This has included working with high schools, community bands, senior centers, and so much more. These connections have long-lasting benefits for us in terms of audience development and future project development.

- PennPAT has made it possible for us to present more performances by more Pennsylvania artists than any other granting outlet provides. Of special note are the unique residency outreach activities that we can design and implement given the proximity and funding opportunities with PennPAT artists. Through several New Directions Grants, we have greatly benefited the artists while simultaneously offering some of the most unique activities that our community has ever seen.

- Last year, Ashland University presented the Cashore Marionettes in its performing arts series of four events. The PennPAT fee support allowed the University to broaden its audience with a school matinee performance and artist workshop. Different generations talked for weeks about their experience with the Marionettes programming with many adults reminiscing about their childhood experiences with marionette shows and young children experiencing their first live arts event. These events excite people about the arts which builds community and brings them back for more.

- By booking SIMPLE GIFTS, the audience was not only able to see an excellent show, but also engage a targeted group of individuals in a music workshop. It was excellent and memorable.

- We have had wonderful partnerships and community activities because of PennPAT. When we brought the Pittsburgh Symphony to our community it was the full realization that we never could have accomplished that partnership without PennPAT. We had a public performance and several educational sessions including one for local teachers on how to incorporate music in the curriculum.

- Our engagement with Illstyle & Peace Productions was a truly positive, well-rounded arts experience. Their residency at the Newark Museum was one of the most polished, informative lecture/demos I’ve ever witnessed; they could relate to audiences from daycare-children to teens and adults. The evening concert was the best we’ve ever seen. The audience just loved it and my director sang their praises to his contact at NJPAC. We now see that Illstyle & Peace will be performing there in December.

- Bringing Atzilut to Baltimore with the support of a PennPAT grant built relationships among community groups we could not have foreseen, exposed a broad group of young music students to two musical traditions they had not encountered before, and put us in ongoing touch with a group of musicians who represent a range of traditions and techniques. Both for our students and for our community, their concerts and lecture/demos were inspiring.

- After years of struggling to expand our audience to school children, and to people to the west of South Mountain, Simple Gifts provided a perfect opportunity to do both. Their involvement in school programs in the days before the concert brought children and their parents to the Music, Gettysburg! concert -- almost all for the first time. And their
workshops in the Chambersburg area attracted audience members from that area, also for the first time.

− Through PennPAT funding, NJPAC has presented professional Philadelphia based companies throughout our seasons. Philadanco stands out from FY12, where they performed to a sold out audience. Members from a local church group chose this performance as an uplifting experience for their 250+ members to attend. School audiences were also engaged, where dance programs from schools attended the performance to gain knowledge and inspiration from an outstanding contemporary dance company. The free master class was also a success. We had an attendance of 40+ students from local community dance schools and training programs in the area. All three events will have a lasting impact on the patrons who attended.

− PennPAT has allowed us to present a touring artist as part of an annual festival celebrating the African American voice and vision of our region for numerous years. Due to the high quality of roster artists, we have been able to partner with a renowned venue in our city to present these artists. In addition, we’ve partnered with various local and low-income schools in order to present these roster artists to students. We are very grateful for the support of PennPAT throughout the years and hope that we will be able to find another funding source so that we may continue to offer this programming.
PennPAT is a very important resource that reduces fees for presenters resulting in lower ticket fees for patrons and gives vetted performers more work.

Non PennPAT Presenter

Section Four: Non PennPAT Presenters or Lapsed PennPAT Presenter

For comparative purposes, 576 non-user or lapsed presenters in the mid-Atlantic region were surveyed and 78 responded.

![Bar chart showing NonPennPAT Presenters (n=78)]

- College/University Performing Arts Center or Series: 6%
- Festival: 9%
- Other: 15%
- Independent Performing Arts Series Producer (No Venue): 21%
- Independent Performing Arts Center (With Own Venue): 49%
What the data revealed:

- 72% of these presenters were familiar with PennPAT and the balance were not at all familiar;

- The majority of these presenters apply for grants to support touring:
  - 22% frequently apply;
  - 55% occasionally apply,
  - the balance never applies.

Sources reported were local government and corporations, state arts agencies, and regional, national and international sources. Those who never apply sited their lack of capacity, smaller return on investment than efforts to boost earned income, or the fact that program content does not lend itself to touring.

Trends in touring varied. This chart shows the proportion of local, in state, out-of-state, and international program content.
Other facts reported:

- 64% of these presenters reported no major changes in presenting since 2009. Those who did attributed changes to the economy; specifically, fewer sponsorships, less disposable income, and higher costs;

- These presenters were asked for sources that inform their presenting and touring choices:
  - 59% reported a high to very high reliance on peer organizations;
  - 56% reported high to very high reliance on community input
  - 55% reported a high to very high reliance on rosters;
  - 58% reported low or very low reliance on showcases for their program content;
  - 46% of non PennPAT users reported a low to very low reliance on block booking;

- 57% reported a high to very high reliance on grants and funding to support touring engagements.

Why these presenters have not applied:

- We have been priced out of the capacity to hire PennPAT artists;

- Have not applied for PennPAT grant due to decision-making vs. grant deadline timing conflict;

- I have not applied for PennPAT funding for a number of years. None of the PennPAT artists were compatible with our programming;

- Not many of the roster artists fit our profile;

- Our venue is so small; we would have to charge $50+ per ticket for unknown performers, which is not feasible in our underserved, urban community.

- Application is complicated. While the funds are helpful, we sometimes find that the benefit is outweighed by the costs of administrative time to maintain/submit the reporting forms.

- I've never applied, but my brief examinations of the guidelines and applications tell me it's quite a bit of work for not enough return.

- The artists in the Philadelphia area are by far some of the more interesting artists. However, due to PennPAT's restrictions on distance, we are forced to select artists from outside this area. While I understand their reasons for this, it makes it difficult to select an artist we would be interested in having perform on our series.

General Perceptions

What these presenters said:

- PennPAT provides strong support to PA based artists. Fairly straightforward grant application process;

- For a larger organization, this is a phenomenal opportunity for cross-pollination of cultural regions;

- Highly respected program in the presenting community. High quality and diversity of artist roster.
Section Five: PennPAT Administration

OVERVIEW

These charts speak for themselves. Program staff is recognized as providing outstanding service and professionalism that have elevated the work of presenters as well as artists.

PennPAT is also recognized as a leader in the field of presenting and, according to many contributing to this report, the envy of other states.
What roster artists said:

- The best thing about PennPAT is the staff. It is and has always been a most personal and caring organization.

- During our first years with PennPAT, program staff sat down with us to review our promotional materials, giving us direct feedback that we couldn’t get anywhere else. We then used those materials to book three tours for ourselves in the following season—the most we had ever done. All of those presenters applied for and received PennPAT support.

- The staff and leadership at PennPAT have been impeccable—supportive, thoughtful, and fair. We would not have had these opportunities otherwise and are grateful to PennPAT for all that they do and for their funding.

- PennPAT has been a wonderful resource in ways both tangible and intangible. The staff has always made itself available to answer questions and provide guidance.

- I also am extraordinarily grateful for the talented and supportive staff who helped answer all my questions and assisted in building truly impactful projects. I can also testify that many artists learned so much about professional touring and promotion with the support of PennPAT.

- I have found the staff, especially Katie West, to be so incredibly available for any question, concern or idea that I have. Everyone is so incredibly helpful and thorough. It has been comforting having their support these years.

- And in so many situations, Katie West and PennPAT have been there for us. With tech grants, and advice, and support. I am forever grateful!

- The requirement and support to have professional created marketing and promotional materials are what it took to help us “get our act together.” Sitting with Katie for honest talk about strategy, promotional materials, and practical suggestions on maximizing showcases—have made ALL the difference.

What PennPAT presenters said:

- Katie West has been a wealth of knowledge and experience for our young organization. From reviewing artist roster and objectively providing feedback on artists that are a good fit for our specific venue specs to reviewing grant application feedback and meeting with me at conferences, Katie has helped to grow our intellectual capital and resulted in the PennPAT roster being our “go to” resource when we program our season.

- The success of this program can be directly attributed to the ongoing leadership of the staff and in particular to the longevity of such a competent and caring leader as Katie West. Along with the support and leadership of Philip Horn and PCA, this program has been a national model for success.

- The PennPAT program has many more high quality artists in a variety of disciplines on its roster than other state arts agencies. Without this program, the University would not be able to bring this type of programming to our small, rural community. Although I have not booked a lot of PennPAT artists, I am envious of the state of Pennsylvania and their far-sightedness. I wish more of our states were this enthusiastic about the artists in their communities.
- It has been a very effective and rewarding program and the process has served us all—presenters and artists—very well. Staff at PennPAT have been instrumental in the program’s success.

- I wish we had a NJ Performing Arts on Tour program here in the Garden State! There is nothing else like PennPAT.

- I honestly feel this program was one of the most presenter-friendly programs in the Arts. PennPAT has truly made such a difference to so many presenters and artists.

- The most recent PennPAT project at our organization involved dancer/choreographer Merián Soto in an ambitious sequence of site-specific new work development and premiere. There was a visionary scope to this extended engagement in The Bronx, and it was both reassuring and useful that the staff at PennPAT understood and vetted the artist in the first place. The sophistication of the PennPAT staff, and the values infused in the support process, can't be overstated. These were all elements that contributed to the success of the project. The PennPAT seal of approval also proved useful in rounding up new local partners, and in leveraging additional interest in our presenting program.

- Each experience has been great for us. The artists are cooperative and approachable and the administration and those that help with the grant process are equally cooperative and encouraging.
Section Six: Reimagining PennPAT for the 21st Century

Roster artists and presenters were invited to prioritize program components they believe would be most vital to them and to touring in the future. Predictably—especially given economic challenges since 2008—roster artists and presenters concur that financial support for touring engagements both in and outside Pennsylvania should supersede all.

This chart and the next show how dependent the touring ecosystem is on outside funding. Despite extensive, compelling evidence weighing how highly artists regard PennPAT’s stewardship services, when pressed to choose priorities, roster artists selected funding. Of particular note is the difference in ratings between artists’ top three and remaining six components. There is a significant 32% drop between artists’ third and fourth priority. As many roster artists shared, “support services have been phenomenally helpful, but the money is everything.”

Roster artists’ next priorities, fee support for Pennsylvania engagements and technical assistance to enhance marketing (which were tied at 60%), speak to the current mindset of artists—particularly emerging artists—that success will depend on their artistry as well as their acumen for continually securing performance opportunities. Marketing and marketing skills will be essential. The world is changing, and the stereotype of the “starving artist” is evolving into “artist as entrepreneur.” Twenty-first century programs supporting the ecology of touring should, as PennPAT has, strive to increase the marketing capacity and business-of-touring knowledge of artists.
Also predictably, of seven program components, fee support for Pennsylvania engagements and fee support for touring engagements outside of Pennsylvania are most important to presenters. Presenters who thrive in the future will be known for great artistry and their ability to keep financial bottom lines strong. Presenters’ high community engagement points to their ever present challenge be relevant in their communities and build market loyalty. Marketing to attract more consumers was rated fourth. As one presenter shared, “It’s very simple: what we present must sell tickets or my organization will not survive.”

Roster artists and presenters, in interviews and focus groups, were invited to reimagine what touring support could be. What could be better? What should be added? What program components should be changed or even eliminated? It is important to mention the fact that ideas and insights informing what a refreshed PennPAT portfolio could be were solicited at the end of longer discussions about the value of the program, how well it’s been funded, with accolades to management. By far, one of PennPAT’s universally recognized assets has been its director, Katie West.

Also recognized is what many described as the PennPAT formula and the synergies among program components: funding strategy + a credible roster or means of quality control + relevant community engagement + technical support and guidance in marketing and the business of touring. To the extent possible, these four components should obviously be retained—if on a more affordable scale. At the time this information was collected, no one yet had any idea what the future of PennPAT might be or if, PennPAT would even continue to exist. Included in this section is a myriad of the most discussed ideas.

### Program Funding and Sustainability

Given wholesale agreement on how unique and powerful PennPAT’s funding partnership has been, roster artists and presenters also realized the very characteristics that have distinguished PennPAT from other artist touring programs around the country (including the portfolio of services, workshops, showcases, retreats, marketing assistance, the database, in-depth professional development, and one-on-one counsel) are what have made program delivery costly. Funding strategies offered were far from definitive, and some were tried by PennPAT in the past.
Of the 87 roster artists and presenters participating in focus groups and interviews, nearly everyone had something to say about program sustainability. These ideas follow:

- Build a more diverse funding base where the support of funding partners is not dependent on one another;
- Seek different combinations of matching support from presenters, communities, artists, and foundations. These could be scaled so all would do their part;
- Pursue nontraditional funding sources to support the community engagement aspects of PennPAT: community building, community development, and creative economies;
- Seek nontraditional funding partners to invest in community engagement aspects of the program; e.g., funders supporting special populations, health care, healthy aging, and public and private education;
- Seek funding partners interested in the professional development aspects of the program such as job training, or small business development funds for new immigrant populations;
- Seek funders interested in creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship;
- Pursue artist exchanges with different states and/or different countries;
- Building on PennPAT’s track record, make a stronger case to potential investors of its plausible leveraging power and social capital (i.e., how PennPAT’s $9.06 million investment leveraged more than $19.7 million in performance fees for roster artists).

Fee support has been, and always will be, highly valued. To strengthen artists’ entrepreneurship, and get a greater return on PennPAT’s investment:

- Consider direct investments to roster artists enabling open funding for touring. Again, optimize economies of scale;
- Given airfares and hotel costs, fund roster artists so as to enable them to piggyback on an existing PennPAT presenter grant.

The Roster
The roster is vital to PennPAT because of its perceived quality assurance. Being a PennPAT roster artist is considered a widely recognized, highly respected mark of excellence. The process of selection to the roster is as rigorous and competitive as it is to remain on it. Artists (both roster artists and non-roster artists) and presenters were encouraged to look ahead and consider different roster constructs; here’s what was shared:

- Refresh the logic, criteria, and rationale for keeping artists on the roster. To some artists and presenters the current process seems subjective;
- Presenters shared that some artists’ episodic roster inclusion (one year on, next year off) has impeded their ability to plan;
- An unresolved debate was if frequency of touring activity should be a criterion for remaining on the roster. Some questioned why artists with limited bookings should remain on the roster. If artists are not affordable or perceived as inaccessible, what is the value of keeping them on the roster?
- Strengthening the strategic segmentation of the roster. Improve the variety, racial diversity, and quality of the roster. Keep pace with the marketplace. Strive for a better balance of performers who can fill a 2500 seat venue vs. a 250 seat venue. Some suggested offering more high quality artists who are popular, marketable, and less esoteric;

- Better screen artists for tour-readiness and better check the clearance of roster artists for community engagement (e.g., ability to work with children, special populations, and different types of communities).

**Program Construct**

Given the realities of our fast changing world, numbers of suggestions were offered to keep the program more aligned with artists’ and presenters’ realities.

- Presenters, particularly those with smaller staffs and fewer resources, suggested that PennPAT consider offering the additional option of “multi-state, curated tours,” or perhaps creating a number of themed tours each year for which PennPAT would serve as manager and broker. The result could be greater efficiency in tour planning and greater program reach;

- The final focus groups/interviews with some emerging artists and presenters who were new to the program or had lapsed and were less familiar with it, encouraged rethinking community engagement as a more strategic and dynamic dimension of touring. They discussed strategies and purposes of community engagement and the role of artists as innovators and problem solvers in addressing community challenges, especially with children, youth, education, place making, and more. To be accurate, there were some roster artists who were not at all interested in this idea; however, emerging artists and new artists on the roster were particularly interested and shared stories of their current artistic projects in this realm;

- Roster artists and presenters encouraged rethinking the value of the artists/presenter contract as a prerequisite to apply for fee support. What may initially have been intended to forge stronger partnerships and working relationships between artists and presenters has become more of a barrier than a benefit. To the chagrin of both artists and presenters, it has dissuaded some presenters from applying.

Refresh the application timing, criteria, and artist and presenter submission requirements.

- Consider new grant timelines that would accommodate a variety of seasons;

- The small financial return (Fee Support Grants) on the large investment of time to submit an application is why some presenters no longer apply. Some suggested streamlining presenter information—perhaps in an online database—so as not to require artist and presenters to submit the same data year after year. Roster artists and presenters could be tasked to keep their information current as a requirement of participation. Then specific project information could be submitted as needed;

- Over the next 10 years, pursue partnerships with funders in different regions of the country and new countries to provide Pennsylvania artists with more opportunities in new places (touring artist exchanges). Building on the idea of PennPAT as broker, optimize economies of scale for travel and marketing expenses;
- Revisit geographic criteria with regard to the 50 mile radius for market eligibility.

Additional Improvements to the Overall Delivery System
Continually strengthen and refresh professional development opportunities and scheduling:
- Consider offering roster artists certificates or credentialing for completion of professional development tracks, professional artistic accomplishments, and more. These could become as much a mark of excellence as the PennPAT Roster imprimatur;
- Consider professional development for presenters on more challenging art forms;
- Consider tiered tracks more suited and relevant to specific art forms or styles;
- Hands-on counsel, information lines, mentoring, and other professional development and guidance will always be essential, especially to artists, but consider cost-effectiveness in the implementation;
- Transform PennPAT Showcases. Seeing work is always preferred, but increasingly impractical. With ever-improving dynamic digital capability create new formats to easily access, see, and chose artists. Take better advantage of existing convenings and forums around the state, region, and country;

Optimize technology on many levels.
- Consider a more robust Web site with password protected portals;
- Get greener! Explore how technology can be used to streamline the granting process. To the extent possible, become paperless. Accept scans of literature and collateral, materials. Not only would this be environmentally smart, it would also reduce application expenses;
- One focus group suggested a combination of Match.com linked with Schedulicity—streamlining the entire process to build awareness and relationships between roster artists, presenters, and presenters’ communities;
- PennPAT will always need excellent mentors and guides as available and capable as the current ones, but why does PennPAT need an office? Explore a virtual office for PennPAT.

If there were no PennPAT, the whole touring area in this part of the country would look very different.

PennPAT Artist
### Section Seven: PennPAT Allocations for all Dollars Spent on all Program Components

January 1997 - June 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>ALL GRANTS PAID (to artists and presenters)</th>
<th>ARTIST ROSTER/PRESENTER GRANT REVIEW (honoraria, travel, food, lodging, space, equipment, prep/facilitation)</th>
<th>MARKETING &amp; TRAINING (roster, website, showcases, conferences, retreats, workshops, promotion)</th>
<th>CORE ADMINISTRATION (salaries &amp; benefits for core administrative staff)</th>
<th>OVERHEAD (rent/utilities, supplies, equipment, phone, postage, insurance, misc.)</th>
<th>PROGRAM EVALUATION (consultants, expenses, staff)</th>
<th>TOTAL SPENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$975,263</td>
<td>$53,363</td>
<td>$137,768</td>
<td>$101,016</td>
<td>$108,655</td>
<td>$30,629</td>
<td>$1,406,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,379,383</td>
<td>$55,590</td>
<td>$390,020</td>
<td>$87,845</td>
<td>$108,929</td>
<td>$40,895</td>
<td>$2,062,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,464,083</td>
<td>$71,254</td>
<td>$320,889</td>
<td>$78,571</td>
<td>$103,377</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$2,047,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,623,217</td>
<td>$71,192</td>
<td>$432,268</td>
<td>$96,071</td>
<td>$115,445</td>
<td>$39,639</td>
<td>$2,377,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,029,881</td>
<td>$59,971</td>
<td>$318,802</td>
<td>$128,447</td>
<td>$126,393</td>
<td>$49,720</td>
<td>$2,713,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,038,010</td>
<td>$49,053</td>
<td>$147,739</td>
<td>$159,265</td>
<td>$96,979</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,491,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (1 YR)</td>
<td>$594,335</td>
<td>$22,208</td>
<td>$29,940</td>
<td>$74,958</td>
<td>$49,057</td>
<td>$26,129</td>
<td>$796,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$9,104,172</td>
<td>$382,631</td>
<td>$1,777,426</td>
<td>$726,173</td>
<td>$708,835</td>
<td>$196,012</td>
<td>$12,895,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program staff*</td>
<td>$1,672,793</td>
<td>$1,024,273</td>
<td>$76,417</td>
<td>$2,773,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$9,104,172</td>
<td>$2,055,424</td>
<td>$2,801,699</td>
<td>$726,173</td>
<td>$708,835</td>
<td>$272,429</td>
<td>$15,668,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Expenses</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PennPAT Grant Program Model**

~ The average number of roster artists per year was 123. Each year, expenses averaged:

- $1,470 per artist on marketing and training
- $4,775 per artist on grants
- $1,078 per artist on artist roster review and presenter grant review,
- $753 per artist on core administration and overhead
Appendix A: The Funding Partners

The Heinz Endowments supports efforts to make southwestern Pennsylvania a premier place to live and work, a center of learning and educational excellence, and a home to diversity and inclusion. Committed to helping its region thrive as a whole community—economically, ecologically, educationally, and culturally—the foundation works within Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the nation to develop solutions to challenges that are national and even international in scope. One of the largest and most innovative independent philanthropic foundations in the country, the Endowments award an average of $60 million in grants each year.

The William Penn Foundation, founded in 1945 by Otto and Phoebe Haas, works to close the achievement gap for low-income children, ensure a sustainable environment, foster creativity that enhances civic life, and advance philanthropy in the Philadelphia region. With assets of nearly $2 billion, the Foundation distributes approximately $80 million in grants annually.

The Pennsylvania Council on the Arts is a state agency in the Office of the Governor. Founded in 1966, its mission is to foster the excellence, diversity, and vitality of the arts in Pennsylvania and to broaden the availability and appreciation of those arts throughout the state. The agency was named among government's top 50 "Best and Brightest" in the Innovations In American Government Awards, a national competition recognizing superior and unique programming initiatives within the public sector. Funding for the Council on the Arts comes from the citizens of Pennsylvania through an annual state appropriation, and from the National Endowment for the Arts, a federal agency.

The Pew Charitable Trusts is driven by the power of knowledge to solve today's most challenging problems. Pew applies a rigorous, analytical approach to improve public policy, inform the public and stimulate civic life.

Mid Atlantic Arts Foundation supports the richness and diversity of the region's arts resources and promotes wider access to the art and artists of the region, nation, and world. The Foundation works in partnership with the state arts agencies of Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Virginia, West Virginia, and with the National Endowment for the Arts to provide guidance and support.

Additional support has been provided by:
- Anonymous
- The Barra Foundation, Inc.
- Comcast (In-kind donation)
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Community and Economic Development
- North Carolina Arts Council
- The Pittsburgh Foundation
- Richard King Mellon Foundation
- The Rider-Pool Foundation
Appendix B: PennPAT Research

Past Program Evaluations

- The mail/email survey of roster artists, which looked at their touring activities, PennPAT program usage, and success over time, has been administered six times—in 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2010.

- In 1999, in addition to the roster artist survey, focus groups and telephone interviews were conducted in locations across Pennsylvania, separately with both roster artists and presenters, to ascertain perceptions of the program as well as the needs in the field.

- In 2001, in addition to the roster artist survey, focus groups with new groups of roster artists were conducted. Case studies were also developed for six roster artists/groups that focused on their overall career development, and how PennPAT fit into that development. The Funding Partners were interviewed to determine their perceptions of the program. Presenter final reports from funded engagements were analyzed.

- In 2003, in addition to the roster artist survey, ten roster artists/groups were interviewed regarding the effectiveness of the Artist Grants they had received. Presenter final reports from funded engagements were also analyzed.

- In 2005, in addition to the roster artist survey, presenters were surveyed, artists were interviewed, artist/presenter pairs were interviewed, grant final report data were analyzed, and an online discussion forum was offered and reviewed.

- In 2008, in addition to the roster artist survey, presenters were surveyed, grant final reports were analyzed, artists and presenters were interviewed, PennPAT’s development efforts were assessed, research was conducted into other touring support models and a Ten-Year Program Synopsis was published.

- In 2010, staff administered the roster survey and pulled data from grant final reports to share with the Funding Partners.