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Following the 2019 Applicant Pool Summary published in March 2019, we wanted to share additional information that compares data about the funded cohort of projects as it correlates to the total applicant pool.
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2019 Cycle Applicant Progression

Of the 1027 total applicant pool, 452 applicants (roughly 44% of the total applicant pool) moved onto Review Two. Marking the midway point, 255 applicants (roughly 25% of the total applicant pool) moved onto Review Three. 91 applicants (roughly 9% of the total applicant pool) moved onto Review Four, and ultimately, 42 applicants (roughly 4% of the total applicant pool) were funded.
Geographic Representation

MAPS 1A and 1B) Geographic representation based on the location of the primary contact (this may be an artist, producer, presenter, or other affiliate) for each application. This year's primary contacts were based in 42 states, including states that were not represented in the 2018 application cycle such as Alabama, Hawaii, Idaho, Mississippi, and Oklahoma. Similar to the 2018 applicant pool, a majority of the primary contacts were based in the Northeast. A total of 16 states, including North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Tennessee, were represented among primary contacts of funded projects.

MAP 1A: Total Pool Primary Contacts
MAPS 2A and 2B) Geographic representation based on one of the projected venue/space/site locations where the applicant has identified that the project may be shared with a public. The scaled maps below display varying degrees of applications we received. Although many project locations are not finalized at this stage in the planning process, it is important to see where applicants may share the work eventually. Interestingly, proposed project locations covered a wider geographic range than did the locations of primary contacts themselves. As the map below reflects, there were only four states in which projects were not proposed. Given that MAP does not fund entire tours, and can only fund activities leading up to a project’s first performance, we only included the first location in the United States listed by each applicant.

Similar to primary contact representation, 17 states were represented among funded project venue locations.
MAP 2A: Total Pool Venue/Space/Site Location
MAP 2B: Funded Venue/Space/Site Location
**Discipline Identification**

Applicants were asked to identify who might best understand their project through the option to choose any combination of dance/performance specialists, music/performance specialists, and theater/performance specialists. Similar to the 2018 applicant pool, most applicants selected a single discipline, with the majority selecting theater. MAP staff use the selection only to pair reviewers with the most relevant experience to each proposal.

Proportionally, the funded projects closely resembled the total application pool. Notable changes from the total pool to the funded pool include an increase in the percentage of music/theater projects and a decrease in the percentage of dance/music/theater projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theater</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Dance/Music</th>
<th>Dance/Theater</th>
<th>Music/Theater</th>
<th>Dance/Music/Theater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pool</strong></td>
<td>34.96%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>14.31%</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>7.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded Projects</strong></td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Artist Statement Format (video vs. written)**

For the past two grant cycles, MAP has been experimenting with format choice. Applicants can submit their artist statement in either a written or video format. While the majority of applicants included written artist statements, this year, more than 15% of MAP’s applicants submitted video artist statements (up by 3.4% since 2018). The ratio of artist statement formats within funded projects closely reflected the initial application pool. MAP is interested in continuing to explore how the application can become ever more expansive in the options that artists can use to represent their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pool</strong></td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded Projects</strong></td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description Author
Across all review rounds, the majority of application descriptions were written from the perspective of the artists themselves. While a small percentage of artist applicants within that subset have their own 501(c)(3)s and/or producing infrastructures, it’s interesting to note that many more artists than producing or presenting institutions sought resources at MAP for project development in 2019.
Project & Venue/Space/Site Relationships

We invite applicants to submit proposals at every stage of project development (meaning they can apply to initiate the project, develop it further, or bring it to its completion). Notably, whereas most of the 2019 applicants had no verbal or written agreement with a venue/space/site and very few had both written and verbal agreements, this was not the case with the funded pool.
Projected Expenses

We asked applicants to identify explicitly what 30% of their projected expenses will be, so that we could have a slightly better understanding of scale across the applicant pool. The following chart breaks down those ranges:

Overview across 1027 project budgets:
- **Total** of 30% of expenses = $37,783,064.41
- **Average** of 30% expenses = $36,789.74
- **Maximum** of 30% expenses = $818,444.70
- **Minimum** of 30% expenses = $675.00

By and large 30% of projected expenses for most applicants were less than $50,000, with a majority in the $0-$25,000 range. That more than half of applicants fell under the $0-$25,000 speaks on some level to the scale of work being created within MAP’s applicant pool, as well as the need for support for projects working in this range.
Overview across 42 funded project budgets:

- **Total** of 30% of expenses = $1,823,359.90
- **Average** of 30% expenses = $43,413.33
- **Maximum** of 30% expenses = $134,009.40
- **Minimum** of 30% expenses = $5,130

30% of projected expenses for most funded applicants remained less than $50,000, with a slight majority in the $0-$25,000 range.
Conclusion

At MAP, systems building and re-building is one of our top priorities, and we know that the best systems are built through constant collaboration and a plethora of perspectives. As we expand this data we welcome any and all feedback. Please email mapinfo@mapfund.org to send us your thoughts.