

# **Digital Inclusion Program Final Report of the Rapid Assessment**

Submitted to  
Wireless Philadelphia  
and the William Penn Foundation

By the OMG Center for Collaborative Learning  
Final revision, December 1, 2008

# Table of Contents

# Page

Executive Summary .....	i
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Rapid Assessment.....	2
1.3 Methodology.....	3
2. Lessons from the Field: Effective Practices.....	4
2.1 Status of Select Citywide Wireless Networks .....	5
2.2 Hardware is an Integral and Necessary Component of Digital Inclusion.....	5
2.3 Local Presence and Technology Capacity are Key Elements of Partners .....	6
2.4 Delivering Reliable Home Internet Access Remains a Challenge.....	8
2.5 Piloting: Scale and Target Populations .....	9
2.6 Implications for Wireless Philadelphia.....	11
3. Evaluation Findings .....	12
3.1 Client Experiences .....	12
3.2 WIPs as Partners: a Wholesale Distribution Model.....	16
3.3 Wireless Philadelphia Staff and Technical Assistance .....	22
4. Summary Assessment .....	24
4.1 What Worked Well .....	24
4.2 What Were the Challenges.....	25
5. Recommendations for Going Forward.....	27
Appendix A. Rapid Assessment Methods .....	i
Appendix B. Effective Practice Sources.....	iv
Appendix C Stakeholder Interviewees.....	v
Appendix D. Interview Protocols .....	vi
Appendix E. Focus Group Guide.....	xi
Appendix F. Summary of Wireless Internet Partners (WIPS).....	xiii

## Executive Summary

In the next several pages, the OMG Center presents the findings of a three month rapid assessment of Wireless Philadelphia's (WP) Digital Inclusion Program (DIP). In response to the need to redirect the Digital Inclusion Program when EarthLink ceased operations in Philadelphia after about a year of partnering with WP to set up the joint venture, OMG worked with WP and the William Penn Foundation to redirect its initial evaluation. All determined that it would be more valuable to WP to have a quick snapshot of progress and challenges to date as it became clear that it would have to rethink its program strategy going forward. To further assist WP leaders, OMG worked closely throughout the rapid assessment with WP staff and board, and Fairmount Ventures, its strategic business planning advisors, by providing quick feedback about what the assessment team was learning.

After a national review of effective practices of citywide wireless efforts and digital inclusion programs, the rapid assessment report discusses the DIP's successes and challenges in its first year of operations. It then offers recommendations for going forward.

## Summary Lessons from the Evaluation

### Accomplishments

#### About the WIP Model

- Certain aspects of the WP wholesale model were effective; central to this was working with wireless Internet partners (WIPs) who were the primary on-the-ground distributors of digital inclusion service packages (which include hardware, software, internet access, training and some follow-up technical support) to pre-qualified clients. This allowed WP to easily access large numbers of targeted users who already had existing relationships with the organization, and who already met low-income criteria. This also provided an income source for WP.
- WP was correct in assuming that free computer distribution is a critical element of the DIP and central to any early success.
- For the most part, the sampled wireless Internet partners (WIPs) were successful with meeting their distribution targets; however, service package distribution is not a sole indicator of increased client digital capacity.
- WIPs with more on-site staff technological capability generally developed programs that integrated Internet and computer technology. This helped clients practice computer and Internet use on-site with assistance, thus more effectively building client understanding and capacity to bridge the digital divide.

- WIPs with administrative and technical staff capacity to fully support the bundle distribution and follow up with client support over time were more able to be effective partners.
- The selected WIPs were very diverse in client types, staff DIP administrative capacity, and technology capacity. Not all came to DIP with similar abilities to carry out the work. The rapid assessment learned some important lessons about WIP characteristics that contributed to success. Additional attention should be paid to understanding success.

### About Client Use and Early Outcomes

- Clients report learning significant technical skills with the digital inclusion service package and through strong WIP programs integrating package use early on and regularly in program activities.
- These clients continued to use computer and Internet skills on- and offline during and when they completed the program.
- Clients also report getting technical assistance through strong WIP programs and through experienced friends and family members, and that access to support is essential early on.
- There is an early indication that increasing individual client capacity to use computers and the Internet may spread to families and friends in communities and thus have indications to benefit the broader, close-in community.

### About WP

- For the most part, WP staff was well viewed by all interviewees, and admired for their passion and commitment to the work.
- The experience of the evaluation indicates that WP staff and board are adaptable, flexible, and eager to learn from the first year.

## What Were the Challenges

### About the WIP Model

- Given that success factors of a WIP model were not initially known, it is understandable that WIP selection was not initially based on organizational capacity to do this work. Nonetheless, the lack of WIP technological and administrative capacity overburdened WP with extra technical assistance and administrative processing demands. It also enabled WIPs to distribute digital inclusion service packages clients without meaningful on-site training, follow-up technical assistance, and without the ability to track ongoing client use.

- Driven by meeting WIP targets rather than the quality and means of new digital learning, WP placed too great an emphasis on the number of people signing up rather than the quality of each sign up experience, and what was required to achieve quality.
- WIPs and WP were interested in tracking client outcomes over time; however, WIPs were not selected based on Management Information System (MIS) abilities to do so, nor were they supported to learn to do so. Also, WIPs did not develop agreements with clients to stay in contact for any longitudinal data collection.

### About WP

- Overall, given the lack of citywide digital inclusion precedent and its inherent start-up complexity, the staff and board were overly ambitious in setting high performance numbers for short-term outcomes.
- WP's role was clearly defined in planning; however, as a result of EarthLink's departure, their role became confounded with that of the internet service provider (ISP) provider, and often an unsatisfactory one at that.
- In part the result of the above point, in part as a result of EarthLink's departure, WP underestimated the training needs of WIPs to help them develop appropriate, technology-oriented program content.

## Recommendations for Going Forward

As WP staff and its board refocus its next phase of work, the evaluation offers the recommendations below based on our assessment.

1. Assume Internet connectivity is essential and be agnostic about the means, but provide computers (preferably laptops), appropriate software, free, reliable connectivity (for up to six months or a year), along with the integrated program training and ongoing technical support.
2. Focus the next two years on six to eight pilot sites, each distributing approximately 50-100 bundles a year. This phase ought to focus on streamlining the acquisition and distribution processes and clarifying the DIP model. WIPs from various fields with distinct clients ought to be selected: youth development, affordable housing, workforce development, and schools are potentially strong areas for partnership
3. Focus on WIP programs that provide quality, integrated learning experiences to small client groups.
4. Develop a set of pilots with a variety of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) based on these criteria:
  - a. In Philadelphia neighborhoods or settings that are easily accessible;

- b. Who demonstrate current program evidence of addressing the digital divide already;
  - c. With on-site dedicated administrative and technology staff for the DIP program,
  - d. With existing WIP programs that integrate technology, or with interest in developing integrated programs beginning from program start-up to finish and on through follow-up;
  - e. With WIP commitments to work with WP and an evaluation team to develop client use and outcome tracking mechanisms during the program and for follow-up;
  - f. And assure a variety of program foci, client types, and ages.
5. Consider the lending library idea for programs as a training method before people get to keep their own hardware. This might help incorporate technology into programs and train people on the equipment they would use -- they don't have to go from desktop to laptop.
6. Continue and streamline hardware distribution.
7. As a city leader, build a learning network and community among the different CBOs for field building, and sharing effective practices locally.
8. WIPs can benefit from ongoing financial support for the development of additional technological capacity; WP can be a citywide advocate for this and also develop a fund to provide matching grants to encourage WIPs to fully commit to partnership.
9. WP ought to explore what it can offer nonprofits to help design programs and educating employees about how DIP fits in with their program model.
10. WP may consider offering digital inclusion clients a range of hardware options, including used and new computers offered at discounted rates or with low/zero interest financing. It may be necessary to partner with banks and retailers.

## 1. Introduction

This report presents the findings and recommendations of a rapid assessment of Wireless Philadelphia's (WP) Digital Inclusion Program (DIP). Conducted by the OMG Center from July–September 2008, the rapid assessment provides a summary of the DIP's successes and challenges in its first year of operations, and concludes with a set of recommendations for going forward in a redesign.

### 1.1 Background

WP's DIP is a unique, national demonstration that aims to improve the quality of life of low-income Philadelphians through access to the Internet and by increasing their client's capacity to use the Internet. In the winter of 2008, Wireless Philadelphia engaged the OMG Center to conduct a full multi-year evaluation of DIP, which was launched in 2007. Following a start-up period in which a DIP theory of change would be fully clarified, the evaluation was expected to provide ongoing feedback over two years to WP and its array of public and private partners. It would provide guidance for fine tuning the program's effectiveness. The first year evaluation was also intended to provide a baseline snapshot of partners and clients, which would be compared to later year outcomes. Ultimately, the evaluation would also provide valuable lessons learned to a broader group of interested parties nationally.

After a three month evaluation start-up period in which OMG conducted a broad array of stakeholder interviews and was set to launch into detailing the DIP's theory of change, it became evident that the DIP would not proceed as planned. EarthLink, the sole wireless Internet provider announced that it would discontinue its municipal wireless business nationally and in Philadelphia. Although many consumers were already less than satisfied EarthLink wireless customers as a result of an often poorly performing network, the period that followed created great uncertainty for WP's DIP. As a result of EarthLink's service unreliability, WP staff assumed unexpected and organizationally taxing sign-up and technical assistance roles. However, and more importantly, EarthLink's eventual, and in the end actual, departure placed WP and the entire pilot DIP model's futures in jeopardy. For a significant time no wireless provider, let alone a reliable one, was available as a partner to carry promised client services.

Thus, while WP was scrambling to progress with the DIP model, its primary means of operation was discontinued. Simultaneously, as a quasi private and public organization with strong ties to the prior mayor, WP struggled to reposition itself in a new mayoral administration. Without going into detail<sup>1</sup>, it can rightfully be said that the new administration was less than enthusiastic about inheriting a citywide wireless agenda. It became increasingly cautious as EarthLink pulled out of the city, and a new carrier had yet to be identified.

It was this context that initially led the William Penn Foundation, the evaluation sponsor, to halt the evaluation until further notice. The foundation then hosted a WP update in the late spring. Shortly after this meeting, OMG, the William Penn Foundation, and WP agreed that it would be

---

<sup>1</sup> Fairmount Ventures was focusing more on this aspect in their business plan research.

valuable to more systematically assess WP's current and future situation. OMG put forth the notion of redirecting evaluation resources to a newly defined rapid assessment.

## 1.2 Purpose of the Rapid Assessment

Conducted from July to September 2008, the rapid assessment aimed to provide a quick evaluative snapshot of program progress to Wireless Philadelphia (WP) during its rethinking of the Digital Inclusion Program (DIP). It was designed to provide an understanding of the successes and challenges of Wireless Philadelphia's Digital Inclusion Program, and the viability of the program and its model separate from those of dismantled EarthLink, the former network provider. Provided in an ongoing and summative basis, along with concurrent research and analyses of the business model provided by Fairmount Ventures, the findings provide evidence-based recommendations about WP's future and the Digital Inclusion Program.

The core questions the rapid assessment set out to address included:

- What exactly is the DIP program model and was this sound historically? Does it make sense to continue this work with modifications? If so, how?
- Assuming that certain programmatic aspects can be disentangled from the Internet carrier/provider issue, are there any elements that can be continued given various different assumptions about carriers/providers? Do these add up to a sound program?
- How effective is WP's DIP model of collaboration with nonprofit and public-sector providers to deliver both training and services to low-income households? What implementation support did the Wireless Internet Partners (WIPs) value from WP? What did they find problematic? What do the WIPs report as key programmatic successes thus far, if any, and what do they report as challenges? Is this model worth continuing? If so, what can be built upon or addressed for WP to expand the program in subsequent years? What aspects need adjustment or major modification to go forward?
- Have any clients encountered benefits of the DIP experience thus far? If so, what are they? What challenges did clients report? For those reporting benefits, has the DIP continued to influence and change the way they use the Internet? For those reporting challenges, can these be addressed by WP and the WIPs?
- What is the current range of perceptions in the broader community about the success and challenges of WP's DIP? What are the implications for WP's future?
- Overall, what are the implications of these findings for WP as it plans its future and reconstructs a business model? What are the implications for an evaluation's next steps, if any?

OMG used three qualitative research approaches to learn about DIP experiences and their implications: 1) a national scan of effective practices; 2) a set of stakeholder interviews with Wireless Philadelphia staff and board members, Wireless Philadelphia funders and technical

assistance providers, Wireless Internet Partners (WIPs), other DIP community partners, and broader city-wide officials; 3) focus groups and interviews with DIP clients.

### 1.3 Methodology

On March 18, 2008, shortly after OMG entered into a contract with Wireless Philadelphia for an evaluation of the Digital Inclusion Program, the OMG team spent the day at Wireless Philadelphia introducing ourselves to the full staff, presenting the original evaluation methodology, and conducting individual interviews with each staff member. This early planning work helped OMG adapt the role of the evaluation during the partnership shifts between Wireless Philadelphia and EarthLink.

In June 2008, once EarthLink disengaged from completing the municipal wireless network in Philadelphia, OMG put the original evaluation on hold and then proposed the rapid assessment approach, since it was clear that information would be needed quickly and on an ongoing basis for use in the future planning of Wireless Philadelphia.

As different program approaches were being considered and new stakeholders entered the picture, the assessment methodology needed to stay flexible enough to meet changing needs. One of these changes included the addition of best practice research to identify what is being done successfully in related fields across the country. Also, Wireless Philadelphia engaged Fairmount Ventures as strategic business plan consultants during the time the rapid assessment was taking place. To increase and coordinate the knowledge among consultants and Wireless Philadelphia, OMG worked collaboratively with Fairmount Ventures to share findings and discuss implications. This took place during two working meetings on July 30, 2008 and August 12, 2008, a number of informal phone calls, and email correspondence.

Overall preliminary outcomes were reported in two additional meetings with Wireless Philadelphia and the William Penn Foundation on July 30, 2008 and August 7, 2008, as well as in one planning meeting with Wireless Philadelphia and board members on September 3, 2008. In addition, OMG provided Wireless Philadelphia two memorandums on July 11, 2008 and September 3, 2008 and a board briefing outlining early data themes on September 5, 2008.

For a full description of methods and sample of the best practice scan, stakeholder interviews, client focus groups, and client interviews please see Appendix A.

## 2. Lessons from the Field: Effective Practices

To provide a national context and understanding of lessons learned in citywide wireless efforts, OMG conducted an effective practice scan comprised of a literature review and practitioner interviews (summarized below in the textbox). Practitioner interviews were conducted with representatives from large-scale digital inclusion programs. Practitioners were asked to describe and assess the various components of their digital inclusion programs and included nonprofit, city-based, and partnership models. Also, interviewees were asked to describe their experiences with piloting and scaling.

### Current Status of Select Citywide Networks

#### Minneapolis, MN:

Started in 2004, Wireless Minneapolis is a public-private wireless network. USI Wireless, the private partner, has completed the build-out of over 59 square miles (98 percent of the city). Residential service is \$19.95 per month, guaranteed for 10 years, and the business rate is \$29.95 per month. USI Wireless is providing free service to up to 100 nonprofit organizations that offer public access to computers, with service anticipated to begin in January 2009. In addition, \$500,000 has been set-aside by USI for a digital inclusion fund to be distributed to nonprofit organizations to build technological capacity. In December of 2007, a third party consulting firm, Novarum, tested the network and found it offered the highest speeds of any citywide wireless network in the nation.

#### Riverside, CA:

Wireless Riverside is a citywide public-private network built and operated by AT&T. It began build-out in 2007. AT&T receives free access to utility poles and the city is an anchor tenant. In addition, AT&T embeds advertising in the content portal. 60 percent of the city's 54 developed square miles are currently covered with free wireless Internet. By December 2008, another 20 percent will be added. The program is encouraging residents to purchase ExpressNets Exp-Antennas to boost in-home signal strength. Digital inclusion components include free refurbished hardware and eight hours of classroom training for approximately 2,000 people a year.

#### Portland, OR:

Metrofi, a private citywide wireless network, launched its network in 2006 and shut it down in 2007. Metrofi cited the cause of the withdraw as insufficient revenue from advertising and subscriptions, as well as a refusal by the city of Portland to purchase anchor tenant services. Currently a local ISP Stephouse Networks has deployed Wi-Fi and Wi-Max to cover seven square miles of the city. Service is free to users for one hour a day up to ten hours per month, or \$20/month. The city administration does not currently have a digital inclusion program.

#### San Francisco, CA:

The initiative began in 2004 and a proposal for a citywide wireless network was awarded to EarthLink and Google in April of 2006. EarthLink withdrew its proposal to build a citywide network in August of 2007, citing corporate reorganization. There are no current plans on the table to find a new network provider. The city's digital inclusion efforts are currently focused on a laptop grant program for college bound foster youth, and the facilitation of partnerships among existing technology-focused nonprofits, corporations, and the city.

#### Miami, FL:

Initiated by Miami-Dade Mayor Carlos Alvarez in 2006, Miami discontinued its efforts to create a citywide wireless network in January of 2008. Currently the city is working with multiple providers to offer free wireless service in select parks and public spaces.

## 2.1 Status of Select Citywide Wireless Networks

As noted earlier, the textbox on the prior page highlights the current status of select citywide networks and the text that follows in this section represents our effective practice findings. Relevant literature and interviews indicate large-scale citywide wireless networks have thus far been largely unsustainable, particularly those involving public-private partnerships. In many cases, issues involving network quality have led to a failure to retain sufficient market demand for individual users and anchor tenants. In cities where citywide networks have been halted (three of the five highlighted on page 4), the digital inclusion programs are continuing with a focus on hardware and Internet training, hardware distribution, and capacity building of community technology centers.

## 2.2 Hardware is an Integral and Necessary Component of Digital Inclusion

Interviewees all agree that there is a large demand for free, low-cost, and/or discounted hardware among underserved populations. Many provide free new and refurbished hardware. In meeting this demand, effective hardware distribution practices include:

**Consistent and standardized supply of hardware donation is critical.**

Donors with a regularly scheduled large-batch replenishment program are preferred over one-time donors. This allows for program supply and distribution forecasting and ease of refurbishing.

- San Diego Futures Foundation receives approximately 4,000 computers per year from the County of San Diego.
- City of Seattle donates approximately 1,200 computers a year to the city's Community Technology Program.
- In 2007, the Boston Digital Bridge Foundation's Project Refresh brought in over 2,000 computers through donations by these partners: Blue Cross and Blue Shield, Edwards Angell Palmer and Dodge, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Jones Lang LaSalle, and Partners Healthcare Systems.

**There is client demand for new computers at discounted rates.**

To meet this need, program directors have developed discounted computer offers for clients who exceed income qualifications for receiving a free computer. These discounts can be negotiated citywide or for clients of partnering organizations.

- Smart Riverside negotiated an agreement with Dell and the Altura Credit Union to provide zero-interest loans for the purchase of new computers.
- Boston Digital Bridge Foundation arranged zero interest and zero down payment loans from Bank of America.
- The city of San Francisco negotiated with Dell to provide a 10-20 percent discount on the purchase of a new computer for those residents who qualified for

the city's earned income tax credit. Through the program, approximately 200 people (5 percent uptake for the pilot population) purchased a new computer.

**The majority of large scale programs are distributing desktops rather than laptops.**

This is due in part to the large stock of refurbished hardware suppliers offering desktops. Some programs augment funding for hardware supply through running e-waste recycling programs. Digital inclusion programs can serve as donation drop-off sites for e-waste, which includes old personal computers and other hardware. The e-waste is then given to recyclers who provide credit to purchase refurbished computers.

- San Diego Futures Foundation generates between \$12k-\$15k monthly through their e-waste recycling program.
- Smart Riverside serves as a drop off location for e-waste, exchanging some of the e-waste to recyclers and selling select items on eBay. Through eBay's Missionfish program, which allows nonprofits to sell goods on eBay at discounted rates, Smart Riverside earns approximately \$3k-\$6k a month.

**Following client demand and the widespread prevalence of technology training programs, the Microsoft Office suite and Windows operating system are the most common software deployed with bundles.**

Many programs have negotiated license discounts with Microsoft or received software specific grant funding for refurbishing.

- Smart Riverside received a Microsoft Unlimited Potential grant to fund software for its Community Computer Program.
- The Boston Digital Bridge Foundation receives donated software from Microsoft for their Technology Goes Home at School program.

## **2.3 Local Presence and Technology Capacity are Key Elements of Partners**

Community based organizations and schools with established technology programs and technical capacity are reported as productive partners. Other attributes reported that increase partnership strength include: consistent client base, regular hours, walking distance to client populations, and on-site training.

**Organizations which prequalify clients on economic need allow for efficient segmenting and targeting of populations.**

Rather than developing in-house capacity to screen client qualifications, digital inclusion programs are able to quickly and effectively locate target populations by working with organizations whose client base meets qualifying thresholds. Also, engaging with umbrella organizations that delegate distributions to multiple sites allows for efficient distribution.

- San Diego Futures Foundation is partnering with affordable housing providers to distribute and maintain hardware in the units of 1,625 families over five sites. The

families qualify for the housing based on a level of economic need which corresponds with the Futures Foundation's definition of target clients.

- The Digital Communities program in San Jose was piloted at three low-income housing properties.
- In Seattle, the Center Park Resident Council was awarded \$12,750 for their Bridging the Gap program, which provides assistive technology training to seven other community technology centers, enabling them to increase computer access for individuals with disabilities.

**Technical support including troubleshooting and the development of basic computer skills are essential components of digital inclusion programs.**

A 2006 evaluation by SRI International of two One Economy Digital Communities reports that new users of computers and the Internet will go to friends, family, neighbors, community technology centers, and technical support phone lines for assistance.

- The SRI evaluation also found that new users are likely to request technical assistance from the source that initiated their introduction to the new technology. Therefore, partners that are able to provide ongoing technical assistance offer a consistent point of contact for troubleshooting and skill development. On-site capacity for support and training and adequate staff resources are essential for the delivery of support. Information on local resources in communities should be readily available. For example, bundles should include maps of locally available walk-in technical support.
- Seattle's Community Technology Program maintains an online resource map and directory that is actively used by both clients and practitioners. AT&T and Microsoft, for example, used the map in locating sites to conduct a "day of caring" visit to update security software at community technology centers.

**To sustain ongoing on-site client training and support, community organizations and community technology centers need to benefit from ongoing financial support for technology capacity building and technology training.**

Funds for technical upgrading and staff support are critical. Developing and retaining technical educational capacity in communities is essential to sustained success of programs.

- Seattle's Community Technology Program distributes approximately \$175,000 through matching grant funds among 10-15 organizations. Examples of grants include \$20,000 for installing hardware at a 15 station learning lab or paying the salary for a half-time staff person for one year.
- Through a community benefits agreement negotiated with USI Wireless, Wireless Minneapolis's Digital Inclusion Fund distributed first round grants totaling \$200,000 to eight community organizations. The second round of grant funding will spread \$300,000 between 10-15 organizations. In addition, Wireless Minneapolis utilizes a federal grant to annually place 25 full-time AmeriCorps volunteers into community technology centers to boost technology programming and technical support.

**Public schools are consistently effective partners.**

Schools have the physical space and staff to implement technological training programs, and clear synergies exist between technological training and student curriculum. Partnerships with schools also allow for efficient scaling, as pilot models can quickly be replicated. The Boston Digital Bridge Foundation reports that buy-in from principals is essential, as well as appropriate technical capacity with respect to computer labs and instructors. There is some evidence that one obstacle to school buy-in is a reluctance to engage in technical support. Schools should have adequate capacity or be presented opportunities to build capacity or outsource technical support.

- Through the Technology Goes Home program, in 2006-2007 Boston Public Schools hosted 53 classes training 450 families and 92 teachers with 250 refurbished computers purchased. Approximately 60-70 percent of teachers remain with the program after their initial year.
- Smart Riverside partners with the Riverside School District to provide adult education classes and free refurbished computers after the completion of four two-hour sessions. The school district provides free classroom space and instructor salaries are paid by the state.

## 2.4 Delivering Reliable Home Internet Access Remains a Challenge

Interviewees indicate that large scale delivery of reliable home broadband Internet service, is a consistent challenge for digital inclusion programs. Programs vary in their provision of Internet access. For example, Seattle emphasizes the connection of community technology centers to landline DSL. SmartRiverside offers free wireless Internet across the city, with fees for premium and business accounts. Boston Digital Bridge Foundation and San Francisco do not provide internet as part of their program model.

**Most digital inclusion programs report challenges in providing in-home access for clients.**

For wireless programs, signal strength can be inconsistent and/or weak for in-home use. In addition, network providers such as Metrofi and EarthLink have found difficulty in developing sustainable business models, leading the companies to pull out of city contracts.

- The SmartRiverside program encourages clients to purchase a signal booster at the cost of \$35, providing screenshot printouts detailing the installation process as part of their bundle training. Client feedback to SmartRiverside reports adequate in-home service.
- Wireless Minneapolis charges between \$14.95-\$29.95 for home accounts and encourages users to purchase their own signal booster.

Acquiring Internet for community based organizations enables large numbers of clients to be reached through fewer Internet accounts.

Negotiations with incumbent providers for free or low-cost DSL service to nonprofit community organizations can be fruitful. Adding Internet capacity to one location enables outreach to multiple clients.

- The city of Seattle negotiated a cable franchise agreement which has provided free DSL service to 225 technology centers and nonprofits, connecting 1215 computers.
- There is some evidence showing that families that qualify for digital inclusion bundles will purchase market-rate Internet service after completing training programs. Survey data gathered by the Boston Digital Bridge Foundation reports that one year after program completion, 50-60 percent of families have home internet access.

Evidence suggests variation in opinion about the importance of content in building Internet use in underserved populations.

Interviewees and research literature note that digital inclusion clients use the Internet for general information seeking, communication, leisure, and job-searching. Clients require information and training on issues of Internet security and safety. Content should be up-to-date and easily navigable. However, among practitioners there is mixed opinion on the development of general content portals developed specifically for digital inclusion clients. Some programs have chosen to develop or purchase new content portals such as One Economy's Beehive. Most digital inclusion programs have focused on increasing access to existing online resources through home pages of local links or adding multi-lingual translation offerings.

- Wireless Minneapolis, which offers citywide wireless Internet, offers a free homepage called the Minneapolis Civic Garden. Through this site, anyone with access to the signal can browse over 150 city related websites. To browse the Internet beyond this civic garden, users must purchase an account.
- Through a \$14,500 grant from Seattle's community technology matching fund, the community service provider Neighborhood House will develop a bilingual online handbook for job seekers. The handbooks will be available in Amharic, Chinese, Oromo, Somali, and Vietnamese and will be developed and distributed to help limited English speakers apply for jobs online at major employers' websites.

## 2.5 Piloting: Scale and Target Populations

A number of pilot digital inclusion programs rely on regular hardware distributions through community partners over the course of a year, rather than single large-batch delivery. Programs that run monthly training courses allow hardware providers to predict and forecast need.

Based on pilot programs run in cities around the country, community digital inclusion technology classes typically involve eight hours of class instruction over the course of one month, and classes range in size from 10-20 people.

This total is approximately 120-240 participants per partner site. Cities typically run between 4-10 pilots. Therefore, citywide pilot programs can range from approximately 500-2000 participants..

- Boston Digital Bridge Foundation's initial pilot for the Technology Goes Home program was run in six neighborhoods. Technology classes involved between 10-20 families per class. The program distributed 1,000 computers in three years.
- The One Economy Digital Communities program in San Jose, California was piloted to 100 total residents at three low-income housing properties. The Digital Communities program in Little Havana, Miami engaged with 100 clients at a community center.

Interviewees note that programs involving youth, especially in peer-to-peer training, are highly effective partners.

Interviewees suggest programs that encourage youth to work together help to build a foundation of mutual support and motivate youth. Additionally, interviewees note that community organizations that serve both parents and children allow for "household" training, which leverages and reinforces use patterns. Interviews reveal significant evidence of trickle-up knowledge flowing from youth to adults. School-based programs that involve parents are particularly effective in this regard.

- Puget Sound Off is a Seattle based program and website that trains youth on multi-media and Internet technology. They encourage youth to develop and post videos, photographs, and blogs. The program is housed by the Metrocenter YMCA and supported by the city, the University of Washington, and One Economy.
- The Seattle Hip Hop Youth Councils Media Masters Young Producers Project was awarded \$15,000 in 2008 for a program for African-American youth in Central and Southeast Seattle that focuses on creating media using new digital arts, audio, and video technologies in collaboration with artists and professionals.
- Boston Digital Bridge Foundation's Technology Goes Home at School program requires parent attendance at training programs. Participants commit to 25 hours of training from the child's teacher after school or on Saturdays

Affordable housing providers with on-site classrooms or computer labs allow for the development of "saturated" geographic clusters and peer networking and support.

Geographic saturation allows for viral/organic growth of developing knowledge.

- A 2006 evaluation of One Economy Digital Communities in San Jose and Miami found that proximity to other users is beneficial in developing new knowledge and resolving technical issues.

- San Diego Futures Foundation plans to partner with three to four nonprofit affordable housing suppliers, each with five low-income housing sites. Focus will be on stimulating providers to develop training and tech support capacity at each site.

## 2.6 Implications for Wireless Philadelphia

In summary, the following field lessons make up central elements for an advanced digital inclusion pilot program:

- Streamlined and high quality hardware distribution is highly effective;
- Hardware, Microsoft Office, and Microsoft Windows must be supplied and affordable;
- Partnerships with community organizations must take into account strong potential partners, characterized by
  - programs utilizing high-speed internet and existing technology,
  - current staff IT technical capacity, and ongoing resources for staff and hardware upgrading,
  - walkable proximity to target populations,
  - a focus on education, and
  - a consistent client base;
- Programs involving youth, families, and housing are particularly synergistic partners;
- Partnership roles need to be consistent and clearly defined;
- Clients must have the ability to receive ongoing training and technical support individually in person;
- While the cost for hardware and software is initially an issue, after successful training clients may be willing to purchase access to the Internet for a typical monthly fee.

### 3. Evaluation Findings

In this section, key findings are highlighted from client focus groups and interviews and stakeholder interviews. The client experiences section includes findings regarding client use, satisfaction, and community impact. The Wireless Internet Partners (WIPs) section describes the WIP partnership model, partner perception, and programmatic use of the DIP, WIP characteristics, and progress distributing bundles. Finally, the Wireless Philadelphia staff and technical assistance section contains findings about the perception of Wireless Philadelphia staff and board, as well as the technical assistance providers WP partnered with to provide DIP services.

#### 3.1 Client Experiences

The evaluation team spoke to 15 clients through individual and group interviews, for more information on the methods and sample, please refer to Appendix A.

**Clients report a wide range of experience with computers prior to the DIP; they also report learning significant technical skills from digital inclusion service packages through strong WIP programs and experienced friends and family members.**

Many clients report using a computer and accessing the Internet in the past, either through school, public places like the community library, and more rarely in their homes. Older clients had limited prior experience with computers and navigating the Internet, but had younger family members who use computers online in school. Some clients report currently having a desktop computer in their homes (only one of whom reported having a desktop in her home during her childhood as well). However, clients with desktops at home rarely had consistent access to the Internet.

***“I have been wanting, well actually needing, a computer in my home for some time so when the laptop offer came up I jumped on that and I’m learning a lot because I have children home...in a computer tech school...I been learning a lot.”***  
**-DIP Client**

Overall, clients reported any training they received from Wireless Philadelphia sources as useful, and a good introduction to using DIP materials such as the laptops themselves and connecting online. However, many did not have a clear understanding of who to call if they ran into any problems, often deferring to the WIP staff that distributed the DIP materials.

***“What’s the best thing about the program? A lot of people didn’t even know how to work computers and the Internet, they learned at the ex-offender program.”***  
**-DIP Client**

Most of the learning clients attributed to WIPs were from programs with content focused on computer and online usage, such as those in an education program focused on technology, or those in work readiness programs that included online training. They also noted that neighbors or family members who have computer and Internet experience were very helpful sources. In addition, clients reported that having a laptop of their own in their home helped them learn much more than they had previously from the limited use of local public computers.

Despite reporting limited access to the Internet as an ongoing frustration and problem, clients reported using DIP materials both off and on line in significant ways.

Not surprisingly, as a result of EarthLink decisions, the vast majority of clients interviewed reported that network connection was a real problem in their homes. They described getting no connectivity or getting limited connectivity in one room of their home, and *“walking around my living room with the laptop trying to find a connection.”* Clients were very frustrated with the service and customer support offered through EarthLink. Many clients also reported being billed in error by EarthLink and receiving multiple calls by EarthLink representatives looking to collect a payment.

Not surprisingly, the vast majority of clients note network connection was a real problem in their homes. They described getting no or limited connectivity in one room of their home, and *“walking around my living room with the laptop trying to find a connection.”*

Some clients attempted to address the connectivity problem by taking their laptops to local “hot spots” or other nearby areas. This strategy resulted in mixed outcomes. One client reported taking the laptop to the hospital where she worked; there she was able to find a connection. Another took it to Love Park and was connected for a short period of time. Two others took laptops to a friend’s house and McDonalds, but were unable to establish a connection. The preference was to have a reliable connection in their homes; however, the majority of clients also expressed high interest in learning where the dependable hot spots are located in the city.

A few clients resorted to paying for broadband through Verizon or Comcast to gain access to the Internet. Service was compared to and rated much higher than that of EarthLink; however, the consensus was that price is an obstacle in the long run and depending on a phone line for a connection is not ideal.

#### Client Use of Materials Offline

Clients reported using the laptop offline for many things. For example, they reported they use it to type school assignments, take notes in class, write journal entries or letters to people, keep track of phone numbers and contact information, and prepare any other documents they need to type. Those in school noted how useful it is to have the laptop with them both on campus and at home, so that they can work in between classes but not have to stay late on campus or travel to campus on the weekends to use the school computer lab.

#### A digital inclusion service package distributed to each client is comprised of:

- A free Laptop with Open Office software suite
- A modem which is designed to strengthen the Wi-Fi signal indoors (also known as Customer Premise Equipment [CPE])
- Free training on:
  - Installation of CPE
  - Internet use
  - Email use
- Free technical support
- Access to free wireless Internet service for one year
  - After one year DIP customers received a discounted rate

**Example #1: Client Profile- Using DIP materials offline**

Dara was a client in a work readiness program. The program targeted laid off workers to strengthen their job skills, and were trained in a computer lab on desktops. Through this training they learned about online terminology and resources. Dara was able to find a part time job in retail, while she also looked for a full time job. With pay stubs to show program staff, and continued participation at the center, she was able to acquire a digital inclusion service package (hardware, software, training, follow up tech support and a DIP EarthLink account). Staff noted that the bundle created incentive for Dara to get a part-time job, and believed *“she was working for the laptop.”*

Dara wrote an essay describing how she planned to use the laptop for school. She had recently started an extended learning program around that time and the computer lab at school was closed by the time she got off from work and went to campus -- she wanted to use the laptop at school during those times. Dara was unable to get a connection at home or school when she got the laptop, but used it for offline work like typing papers and documents. It was really helpful to Dara to type out rough drafts of school work and then to transfer them to an online computer to print or send via email.

Dara did experience a software problem since the computers in her school lab have MS 2007 but the software on her DIP laptop was MS 2003 and on her home desktop she had MS 2000. Dara had to convert files from her laptop to make them compatible at school. It took a good amount of work when graphics and bibliography settings were applied, but Dara was happy just to have a backup hard copy of the text.

Now, as Dara notes: *“When I need to get online I use a desktop in my house with a DSL connection. However, when my desktop last broke down, I was happy to have the laptop and removed the wireless card so I could use the DSL and printer to email and do research for school projects...I was able to get the desktop fixed eventually, but when the phone lines are not working (which happened the day of the interview) I am not able to connect to DSL. And that is frustrating.”*

**Client Use of Materials Online**

When able to connect to the Internet, clients reported using the DIP material most often for job searches. Also, they reported emailing, sharing music, researching school projects, and personal knowledge and information, and having their children and young adults in their families use DIP materials to do homework. Most email activity reported was to professional contacts or those associated with a public program (e.g., a social worker affiliated with the WIP in which the client is involved). There were limited reports about emailing personal contacts, though one client did report that when she had EarthLink service, she was able to keep in touch with a friend over email who was a U.S. Marine. Also, one WIP reported noncustodial fathers using the laptops to communicate with their children.

***“From Comcast, people say it comes up fast, but they are paying \$33 a month; it’s important to me but that is very pricey for me and my family.”***

### Example #2: Client Profile- Using DIP materials online

Jose is a client of a technology education focused WIP program. While considering buying a computer for school, he was happy to hear about the DIP offer from the WIP, which would help him save money. With his GPA of at least 2.0 he wrote an essay and qualified for a laptop.

After receiving the DIP materials, he used his computer for school work, to search for jobs online, and to email his resume to potential employers. Jose had no hardware or software problems and he was able to reliably connect to the Internet in his home. Jose even had friends over to his house (both those with and without laptops of their own at home) to email their resumes, search for jobs online, check out websites, and watch television online. He said, *“Friends might want to come over and get on the computer and check email...or they might get on there and do job searching too.”*

The DIP materials are important to the education he is pursuing. Jose explained, *“It made me feel a little better about school, like school really wants to help you out, you know what I’m saying? Instead of you staying hours and hours after school trying to catch up on work, now you have the opportunity to actually go home and do work on your home computer. It helps a lot.”*

Clients also expressed interest in using DIP materials for online billing, purchasing items, and online schooling. However, they noted significant fear about online security, which currently limits them from pursuing this. Clients also expressed concern and confusion about having free reliable anti-virus software. One client downloaded what he thought was free security software online, but claimed it created serious problems on his laptop.

Clients strongly indicated that reliable Internet access and digital inclusion in their community was essential, and interview data suggests some early local outcomes.

Clients voiced a strong need for digital inclusion in Philadelphia communities. There was an excitement about free and low cost hardware and Internet service, since cost was the most important factor prohibiting many clients from adopting these technologies. However, clients also noted that there is no advantage to the Internet service being free if it does not work reliably.

While DIP clients are not emailing friends and family members as much as potential career contacts, those with DIP laptops and an Internet connection are having community members visit their homes to send out emails with resumes to potential employers, search for jobs, and for entertainment purposes like watching television shows online. In addition, clients described using ‘craigslist.org’ to search for used furniture for sale in their community or other items being sold by people in their neighborhood. This was an area of excitement, with clients noting it is a very rich community resource where you can “find anything.”

***“Everyone should have a computer...”***

***“You can do whatever you want to do...”***

***“You can do so many things...it is perfect...”***

***“With it being a laptop I can take it with me too...”***

***- DIP Client Focus Group***

Those with younger children in the home talked about their children's presence on social networking websites, like 'myspace.com' or 'facebook.com', and relatives using 'match.com' and 'youtube.com'. However, clients themselves did not report using the social networking sites.

Finally, according to one WIP with a social movement agenda, clients who are taxi-cab drivers are learning the basic steps of video editing as a form of empowerment, with the ultimate goal of making documentaries for labor organizing in their communities.

### 3.2 WIPs as Partners: a Wholesale Distribution Model

Planning assumptions detailed role expectations between WP and the WIPs; however, during implementation, the WP role became ambiguous to many of the WIPs.

The mission and intention of Wireless Philadelphia's Digital Inclusion Program, as outlined in a public memo dated May 21, 2007, is to "create a ubiquitous, affordable wireless Internet network that will support small business, enhance government efficiency, improve the visitor experience and promote Digital Inclusion." The primary vehicle through which this was to be accomplished was through Wireless Internet Partners (WIPs). These would be "established, highest-quality community-based organizations that can identify, qualify, subscribe, handle payment, and distribute the [DIP bundles] according to their goals and benchmarks." To identify the WIPs serving low-income users, WP tapped their board members and other stakeholders.

The WIPs were expected to identify and reach their program clients who were pre-qualified low-income individuals and families for whom the acquisition of technological hardware and broadband communication services would be a financial hardship. Furthermore, WIPs were to be capable of providing initial training to the individuals that received DIP materials, so as to prepare them to use the equipment.

Using this wholesale distribution model, WP goals for digital inclusion participants were ambitious: to get 1,000 households connected by the year ending June 30, 2007; have 3,000 households connected by the year ending June 30, 2008; and to have at least 10,000 households receive complete bundle by the fourth year of operation. In March 2008, staff interview data indicated actual progress on digital inclusion targets depended on EarthLink's ability to provide a reliable network throughout Philadelphia. Indeed, this was confirmed by other interviews with WIPs, and clients.

In the partnership model detailed above WP was to have three main roles – to find and distribute low-cost laptops with wireless connectivity to the WIPs, train WIP staff to provide support to their clients in using the laptops, and mediate the setup and maintenance of user accounts between the WIP and the Internet Service Provider (ISP--EarthLink).

Interviews revealed that the model described above changed significantly from its intended design during implementation. For example, WP's role expanded early when it became evident that the technical support needs of the clients were more than the WIP staff could provide – nor were they being met by the ISP. After discovering this, WP engaged VKG, a local group of

training and technical support consultants who were given the role of fielding support calls from clients regarding the hardware. Using WIP feedback, Wireless Philadelphia adaptively added additional training for clients to bolster the training WIP staff was giving. Also, as is commonly understood, the WP role became even more complicated when the ISP, EarthLink, decided to pull out of the partnership and stopped providing technical support of any sort.

Interviews also suggest that the roles played out in the partnership model also shifted as a result of poor WIP capacity to provide Internet-based programming and technical assistance to the clients. The WIPs were to be selected based on their ability to “qualify, subscribe, handle payment, and distribute [DIP materials] according to their goals and benchmarks.” However, evidence from interviews indicates that a number of the WIPs did not have sufficient Internet-based training, nor on-site Internet/computer technical assistance. Thus, the technical assistance role fell to WP.

Interviews revealed that as a result of these changes, many of the WIPs became confused about WP’s role. Many viewed WP as a utility. In this role WP was identified with providing access to the Internet through EarthLink, equipment and all types of technical support. Thus, all service problems were attributed to WP.

#### **WIPs and their target populations are a diverse group.**

The team conducted interviews with staff members from 10 of the WIPs, and the sample reflects WP’s WIP diversity. In total, 41 organizations were identified to OMG as WIPs. A summary of these WIPs by service area can be seen in Appendix F.

Thirty-nine percent, or 16, of the WIPs represented education or health/mental health organizations. The 16 organizations within these categories represented organizations that targeted both children/youth and adults. Another 30 percent, 12, of the organizations were from community and economic development or workforce development organizations. These 12 organizations ranged widely in size, populations served, and geography. The remaining 13 organizations represented organizations offering services in housing/homelessness, public welfare, social networking, youth development, fatherhood, and technology.

#### **WIPs have made significant progress with reaching annual targets for the distribution of digital inclusion service packages.**

The WIPs each had an individual goal for service package distribution and a uniquely established set of benchmarks for their clients to reach prior to receiving a package. These benchmarks varied from maintaining a job or housing for six months to attending parenting workshops. The chart below outlines the benchmarks, target bundle distribution, and progress made for each WIP program we interviewed.

<b>WIP Reported Progress: Distribution Targets</b>				
<b>WIP</b>	<b>Main Client Benchmark</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Distributed</b>	<b>Percent Reached</b>
1	Be housed 60 days	100	90	<b>90%</b>
2	Attend 12 parenting/life skills workshops	15	13	<b>87%</b>
3	6 month job retention	150	125	<b>83%</b>
4	6 month job retention or a GPA of 2.0 (depending on program)	150	151	<b>100%</b>
5	6 month job retention	25	25	<b>100%</b>
6	6 month job retention	25	25	<b>100%</b>
7	Show economic disadvantage, and have home with special needs child	150	100	<b>67%</b>
8	4 week digital media training	40	35	<b>75%</b>
9	Be a client of one of 8 agency partners focused on re-introducing clients into larger community	200	200	<b>100</b>
<b>Totals Among Sample</b>		<b>991</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>77%</b>

The representative interviewed by OMG for the tenth WIP was not directly engaged in package distribution and therefore had no knowledge of distribution target progress. Overall, the distribution progress indicates that none of the benchmarks for the 10 WIPs we interviewed significantly prohibited package distribution. The targeted range of service packages to be distributed was 15 to 200, with most WIPs having a target of 100 or more. The median percentage of targets reached was 90 percent or more. The WIPs in our sample had a total of 991 target bundles, and distributed a total of 764. Overall, the WIPs reached 77 percent of the aggregate distribution target.

**Evidence strongly indicates that service package distribution is not an indicator of client Internet capacity building: *when* they were distributed and *how* they were used in the program suggested more about outcomes.**

Despite consistent progress made across WIPs in distribution numbers, there was variation in the information reported about client outcomes of these distributions. This variation was largely based on when packages were distributed in the program, the degree of program focus on and integrated use of the package, and the technological know-how of the WIP organization.

### WIP Example #1: WIP Program with Distribution at the End of the Program

One workforce development WIP program had a goal to distribute 25 laptop service packages to its clients. The benchmark established for a client to receive the package was six months of employment, which also marks the end of their formal contact with the program.

After identifying clients who were eligible to receive the packages they noted the, *“biggest challenge was tracking down clients to have them come pick-up their packages.”*

The WIP intended to support their clients and WP by providing an incentive to their clients. This backfired to the WIP as they then struggled to find the successful students.

### WIP Example #2: WIP Program with Distribution during the Program

A training and education WIP program had a goal to distribute 40 computers to its clients who completed four weeks of training. It was intended for clients to use their laptops to continue and practice following the training the work began in class.

They specifically worked on using digital, audio, and video as a tool to tell their personal stories. The WIP provided additional software and training on these issues beyond what was received by WP and its trainers and said, *“Getting component parts to our communities...it’s been fine...People are using it, for info on Philly, and people were using it in ways we are training them to. We are training them on video and audio...It’s been great.”*

WIPs report that the packages function as effective incentives for program participation and retention. However, to achieve increased client Internet use, evidence indicates that rather than give the package to a client at the end of a program as a reward, WIPs who gave out the bundle earlier -- when they were continuing to work with the client -- were more effective. This allowed staff to coach clients with laptop use on site. Similarly, these programs also tended to use computers and the Internet as tools for program training.

WIPs with more technological capability generally had developed programs that integrated Internet and computer technology that helped clients practice on site with assistance, thus more effectively building client understanding and capacity to bridge the digital divide.

Similarly, WIPs that are tech savvy tended to have technology built into their program activities (for example, clients participating in workshops about online classes or searching for jobs online). Integrated activities incorporated digital inclusion with program goals, and aligned reasons for clients to access the Internet with events currently happening in their lives. Many WIPs we talked to did not report having staff dedicated to technology or high levels of technological capacity in house.

Programs without a technology component lacked a strong focus on motivating clients to use current technology or provide access to the skills necessary to become comfortable doing so. However, there were solutions to this problem when it was in the WIP agenda. For example,

several WIPs without technology staff involved a third party to play the role of tracking clients over time, providing technical assistance, or developing program related online content for clients. Clients from these WIPs reportedly had very positive experiences with the bundles, and were continuing to learn a great deal. One client even mentioned staying in touch with a WIP program officer via email.

#### **Example: Technology Integrated WIP Program**

The Department of Behavioral Health (DBH) currently contracts with 8 agencies to provide recovery focused day services to persons with mental illness who also frequently struggle with co-occurring substance abuse. Many of these individuals are socially isolated and have no access to technological resources to expand their knowledge of community resources and opportunities to advance their recovery.

In an effort to address these issues, DBH partnered with Wireless Philadelphia to provide 200 laptop computers and wireless internet access for program participants in the form of lending libraries. Individuals are now provided with the hardware, training and encouragement needed to use the internet to seek out resources corresponding to their personal recovery goals and interests, including: educational and employment opportunities, housing resources, public transportation information, faith based activities, and social/recreational events

As participants work toward the progressive achievement of their personal goals, they are able to check out the laptops for longer periods of time from the lending libraries. Eventually, individuals who demonstrate substantial and sustained success, including some program graduates, are permitted to keep the computers and retain access to wireless internet service. This arrangement is contingent upon participants' compliance with periodic hardware checkups to ensure that the computers are being well maintained.

Wireless Philadelphia also engaged the College of Physicians to build a micro-website that facilitates the sharing of extensive resource information and inspirational accounts of personal recovery successes in a convenient, user friendly format. Day program participants were extensively involved in designing this micro-website that was made possible via a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

WIPs with administrative and technical staff capacity to fully support service package distribution and follow-up with client support over time were more able to be effective partners.

The WIPs described a lengthy process for package distribution including identifying clients, ordering bundles, storing bundles, contacting clients to pick up bundles sometimes after a waiting period of up to four weeks, presenting the bundle and filling out paper work on-site, and having to filter follow-up calls to Wireless Philadelphia staff or technical assistance providers. One respondent estimated basic distribution took 30 minutes per client, and this WIP had 150 clients, 50 percent of whom make follow-up calls to the WIP with questions and technical issues.

Follow-up questions for WIPs rather than Wireless Philadelphia, VKG, or EarthLink was a common theme reported by partners. WIPs explained that after a package distribution, clients engage them with a full range of questions, many focused on technical support.

WIPs with more staff capacity to address these calls or forward them to VKG had less of a struggle during the period following package distribution when a large volume of clients call for the person who gave them the package directly, increasing client satisfaction.

**WIPs with more individualized approaches to personalized benchmarks seemed to suggest stronger client outcomes.**

In these cases, each client is assessed based on unique targets and accomplishments, future plans, and desire, and perceived ability to use a digital inclusion service package rather than meeting a set of standard goals. For example, one WIP explained that obtaining a GED to one client is a very big step on their journey, while to another it might not be so important. To have a benchmark of obtaining a GED would not ensure quality distribution. In these situations, a case-worker or program staff member was responsible for client following up for some time after the package was distributed, or clients remained connected to the program in other ways. Using benchmarks in this manner facilitated the incorporation of computers and being online into a client's life, rather than service packages acting as a motivator and reward for completing separate WIP program goals.

**WIPs were unable to identify other partners, though select WIPs discussed the value of forming a network of partners to share best practices and increase knowledge around a larger social goal.**

None of the WIPs interviewed mentioned other WIP partners of Wireless Philadelphia. Their unawareness, even when probed, supports the notion that most WIPs are tackling their programmatic goals individually, and any digital inclusion work they incorporated into the program is being approached that way as well.

***“We can't be 40 or 50 orgs trying to individually solve this, but how that relationship moves forward, is a question mark. Might we be stronger if we put our heads together and worked together on this more directly?”  
-WIP***

A couple of the WIPs with more technology integrated programs, while unaware of the other specific partnerships, talked about the need for organizations to work together across program goals for digital inclusion. One of these WIPs suggested organizing a best practice conference in donated space where WIPs can share what works best for clients and what does not. However, the majority of WIPs did not have a sense of digital inclusion as part of their programmatic goals, and these WIPs talked more about what the digital inclusion program services added to client program motivation and satisfaction rather than what role the program played in building client capacity to bridge the digital divide.

**Finally, several WIPs would like to track client outcomes systematically over time. However, almost all WIPs we talked with have very limited data collection capacity.**

At best, WIPs send Survey Monkey emails with little response, or rely on individual feedback from case-workers with no real information storage system. Choosing WIPs with the interest and capacity to track clients over time allows the program and partnership to be more adaptable and fit client needs.

### 3.3 Wireless Philadelphia Staff and Technical Assistance

For the most part, WP staff received strong positive reviews for the work they do with the WIPs and DIP clients.

Several interviewees identified WP staff as the greatest strength of the organization. Their “commitment” and “passion” were frequently mentioned as forces which make the overall organization and mission more appealing. According to staff interviews, Wireless Philadelphia shifted the DIP sign-up method for clients as well, so that they were able to pay WP staff directly and Wireless staff would then obtain their EarthLink account. While this made more work for WP staff members, it reportedly saved clients from going to Western Union or being unable to sign-up through the online credit card process. This willingness to assess and shift program activities based on client needs is an important strength moving forward.

The quote that best describes WP’s communication with the WIPs is “*Extraordinarily responsive. Agnes and Dionne always there.*” This sentiment was shared by all respondents. Others stated that despite the hardware issues they faced they, “*always felt very well supported.*” Furthermore, another WIP said, “*It was really phenomenal all of the consumers were able to use the computers once they got them fixed and they use them for job searches and to help their children with homework.*” All of these statements point to a particular strength within the WP organization – namely communication. This high level of customer service left WIPs able to withstand any other issues presented through their partnership with WP.

Wireless Philadelphia technical assistance providers received mixed reviews from WIPs and DIP clients.

Many WIPs noted that WP “*did a good job of getting us computers.*” There were several WIPs however, that noted at least a third of the computers they received required some hardware or software fix to get them to function (e.g., missing or malfunctioning power cords, bad batteries, or malfunctioning network cards). This caused at least one WIP to question the price tag for the hardware given this WIP’s belief that for the same price they could have received a new PC with a warranty.

***“The training aspect was good. Training our guys, they actually came to our location with both the staff and the clients. They always kept in contact with us as far as training opportunities.” - WIP***

The training provided by WP and its technical assistance providers was highlighted in several interviews as the most powerful piece of WP’s services to the WIPs. The training prepared staff to handle the distribution and initial questions of clients, and provided clients with a basic introduction to technology which was unfamiliar to many of them.

The evaluation team observed a VKG train-the-trainer session for WIP partners, which covered how to set the network equipment; how to call technical support; how to use a web browser; how to use email; and also recommended websites. This training was well received by the attendees, which represented a wide range of WIPs. The facilitator had an interactive and dynamic approach, and he elicited ideas from the group which were relevant to the specific client groups represented.

Though the training was well received, there were at least two incidents reported in our interviews where trainers did not appear for scheduled trainings, and another where the trainer was unable to conduct the training interactively because another technical assistance provider had failed to provide the laptops in time for the training.

## 4. Summary Assessment

As Wireless Philadelphia staff and board continue to reflect about its first tumultuous year, the OMG team offers a few broad thoughts. This start-up was unusually challenging given the backdrop of EarthLink's technical problems and pull out, and the experimental nature and lack of precedent for the project. The mayoral transition posed additional unusual challenges given that WP was partly conceived by Philadelphia's departing mayor. However, WP was similar to other new organization start-ups in that its staff and board had overly ambitious expectations for the scale and type of client impact within the first two years. Indeed, the first year has grounded all expectations.

Exhibiting the behavior of an adapting, learning organization, WP's board and staff have appropriately begun to refocus the program based on early lessons learned. In this section is an outline of the summary lessons based on the effective practice scan and the findings of the rapid assessment: what worked well and what were challenges.

### 4.1 What Worked Well

#### About the WIP Model

- Certain aspects of the WP wholesale model were effective; central to this was working with WIPs who were the primary on-the-ground distributors of digital inclusion service packages to pre-qualified clients. This allowed WP to easily access large numbers of targeted users who already had existing relationships with an organization, and who already met low-income criteria. This also provided an income source for WP.
- WP was correct in assuming that free computer distribution is a critical element of the DIP and central to any early success.
- For the most part, the sampled WIPs were quite successful with meeting their distribution targets; however, package distribution is not a sole indicator of increased client digital capacity.
- Creating client benchmarks for package distribution acted as incentives; however, those that created client specific benchmarks may hold promise for greater client success, as do those that distribute packages early on in their programs.
- WIPs with more on-site staff technological capability generally had developed programs that integrated Internet and computer technology; this helped clients practice computer and Internet use on site with assistance, thus more effectively building client understanding and capacity to bridge the digital divide.
- WIPs with administrative and technical staff capacity to fully support the package distribution and follow-up with client support over time were more able to be effective partners.

- The selected WIPs were very diverse in client types, staff DIP administrative capacity, and technology capacity. Not all came to DIP with similar abilities to carry out the work. The rapid assessment learned some important lessons about WIP characteristics that contributed to success.

### About Client Use and Early Outcomes

- Clients report learning significant technical skills with the DIP bundle materials and through strong WIP programs integrating technology use early on and regularly in program activities.
- These clients continued to use computer and Internet skills on- and offline during and when they completed the program.
- Clients also report getting technical assistance through strong WIP programs and through experienced friends and family members, and that access to support is essential.
- There is an early indication that increasing individual client capacity to use computers and the Internet may spread to families and friends in communities and thus have indications to benefit the broader, close-in community. Many clients reported successfully integrating DIP materials into their everyday lives, especially those with stronger WIPs and a social network of Internet users. Some of these clients also reported knowledge and resource sharing with community members, indicative that this approach is one way to work incrementally to meet citywide scale.

### About WP

- For the most part, WP staff was well viewed by all interviewees, and admired for their passion and commitment to the work.
- The experience of the evaluation indicates that WP staff and board are adaptable, flexible, and eager to learn from the first year.

## 4.2 What Were the Challenges

### Context Challenge

- It is imperative to again state how derailing, distracting, and confounding EarthLink's unreliable service, pull-out, and system dismantling continued to be for Wireless Philadelphia, its WIPs, and clients. *A reliable wireless system is a must* for a Wireless Philadelphia program if wireless is its modus operandi.
- Also, the association of WP with the former mayoral administration was a barrier to some current citywide players embracing the initiative. And for many, WP was and is a city, or

a quasi-city initiative. Along with the above challenge, the current mayor's lukewarm attitude rippled as caution throughout the community.

### About the WIP Model

- Given that success factors of a WIP model were not initially known, it is understandable that WIP selection was not initially based on organizational capacity to do this work. Nonetheless, the lack of WIP technological and administrative capacity overburdened WP with extra technical assistance and administrative processing demands. It also enabled WIPs to distribute digital inclusion service packages to clients without meaningful on-site training, follow up technical assistance, and without the abilities to track ongoing client use.
- Driven by meeting WIP targets rather than the quality and means of new digital learning, WP placed too great an emphasis on the number of people signing up rather than the quality of each sign up experience, and what was required to achieve quality.
- WIPs and WP were interested in tracking client outcomes over time; however, WIPs were not selected based on Management Information System (MIS) abilities to do so, nor were they supported to learn to do so. Also, WIPs did not develop agreements with clients to stay in contact for any longitudinal data collection.

### About WP

- Overall, given the lack of citywide digital inclusion precedent and its inherent start-up complexity, the staff and board were overly ambitious in setting high performance numbers for short-term outcomes.
- WP's role was clearly defined in planning; however, as a result of EarthLink's departure, their role became confounded with that of the internet service provider (ISP), and often an unsatisfactory one at that.
- In part the result of the above point, in part as a result of EarthLink's departure, WP underestimated the training needs of WIPs to help them develop appropriate, technology-oriented program content.

## 5. Recommendations for Going Forward

As WP staff and its board refocus its next phase of work, the evaluation offers the recommendations below based on our assessment.

1. Assume Internet connectivity is essential and be agnostic about the means, but provide computers (preferably laptops), and appropriate software, and also provide free, reliable connectivity (for up to six months or a year). WP, its board, and heavy-weight funders might consider making a full court press on telecommunications corporations, such as Comcast and Verizon, to be partners by subsidizing hardware and access.
2. Focus the next two years on six to eight pilot sites, each distributing approximately 50-100 service packages a year. This phase ought to focus on streamlining acquisition and distribution processes and clarifying the DIP model. WIPs from various fields with distinct clients ought to be selected: youth development, affordable housing, workforce development, and schools are potentially strong areas for partnership.
3. Focus WIP programs more on the quality of an integrated learning experience to a smaller number of pilots and clients. This is likely to lead to deepening WP's understanding of what works rather than focusing solely on distribution counts and basic hardware and connection training. Since clients share with community members and families it is more effective to fully empower select individuals than to widely distribute bundles with just surface training, giving people no reason to access the Internet or develop the tools needed to feel comfortable doing so.
4. Develop a set of pilots with a variety of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) based on these criteria:
  - a. In Philly neighborhoods or settings that are easily accessible;
  - b. Who demonstrate current program evidence of bridging the digital divide already;
  - c. With on-site dedicated administrative and technology staff for the DIP program
  - d. With existing WIP programs that integrate technology, or with interest in developing integrated programs beginning from program start-up to finish and on through follow-up;
  - e. With WIP commitments to work with WP and an evaluation team to develop client use and outcome tracking mechanisms during the program and for follow-up;
  - f. And assure a variety of program foci, and client types and ages.

WIPS must meet criteria above and be held accountable for tracking outcomes and keeping in touch with clients for at least a year following program completion.

5. Consider the lending library idea for programs as a training method before people get to keep their own hardware. This might help incorporate technology into programs and train people on the equipment they would use -- they don't have to go from desktop to laptop.

6. Continue and streamline hardware distribution. Wireless Philadelphia ought to seek hardware partners who can provide consistent, large-batch donations of either desktops or laptops. Possible partners include the city government, educational institutions, and corporations. All computers should be quality checked before distribution.
7. As a city leader, build a learning network and community among the different CBOs for field building and sharing effective practices locally.
8. WIPs can benefit from ongoing financial support for the development of additional technological capacity; WP can be a citywide advocate for this and also develop a fund to provide matching grants to encourage WIPs to fully commit to partnership.
9. WP ought to explore what it can offer nonprofits to help design programs and educating employees about how DIP fits in with their program model.
10. WP may consider offering digital inclusion clients a range of hardware options, including used and new computers offered at discounted rates or with low/zero interest financing. It may be necessary to partner with banks and retailers.

## Appendix A. Rapid Assessment Methods

### Best Practice Scan

In order to provide the most useful insight into the assessment of Wireless Philadelphia's program model, we shifted away from a traditional literature review and towards a practitioner based effective practice scan. This scan is comprised of interviews with representatives from ten organizations, focusing primarily on leaders of digital inclusion programs in cities of similar scale to Philadelphia, as well as prominent researchers and evaluators in the field. Interviewees were selected through a snowball sampling method, in which respondents were asked to identify other potential interviewees, until a consistent network of relevant practitioners became evident. Practitioner interviews were conducted with the purpose of gathering insight from past program efforts. This body of applied knowledge serves as both a metric against which to measure the strengths and weaknesses of Wireless Philadelphia's model, as well as components which can be replicated in future program development. For the list of interviewees and literature, please see Appendix B.

### Stakeholder Interviews

OMG put forth a preliminary list of suggested stakeholder interviewees to participate in the rapid assessment of the Digital Inclusion Program and asked Wireless Philadelphia and the William Penn Foundation to add to the list. This approach guaranteed a thorough record of informants to which minor additions were made as necessary during the progression of the assessment.

Each potential stakeholder interviewee received a letter from Wireless Philadelphia introducing OMG Center for Collaborative Learning and the rapid assessment in which they might be asked to participate. OMG made at least three attempts to contact each individual by phone and email. If we did not hear back from an organization after three attempts or if a representative from an organization was hesitant to talk with OMG, we consulted Wireless Philadelphia and the William Penn Foundation for an additional contact person at that organization or an alternative suggestion.

Ultimately, there were 34 possible sources for informants, five of which OMG was unable to schedule interviews with and five which refused to participate. The main reasons for hesitancy or refusals were a lack of knowledge about Wireless Philadelphia, the assumption it was an initiative based in the former mayor's administration and not an initiative currently being integrated into city departments, and simple staff turnover of those most knowledgeable about the topic. EarthLink cancelled a scheduled interview with OMG after announcing the end of its partnership with Wireless Philadelphia.

In the end, OMG conducted semi-structured stakeholder interviews with representatives of 24 sources. The list of all stakeholder interviewees, including Wireless Philadelphia staff and board, funders and technical assistance providers, Wireless Internet Partners (WIPs), other DIP community partners, and broader citywide officials, is included in Appendix C. We conducted both in-person and phone interviews depending on the availability and preference of interviewees. These interviews ranged in time from approximately 30 minutes up to 75 minutes. Interview guides can be found in Appendix D.

## Client Focus Groups and Client Interviews

OMG proposed conducting four focus groups with DIP clients during the rapid assessment. However, due to the time intensive process of contacting potential participants via phone to ask for informed consent and confirm scheduled appointments, as well as the potential for low turn-out, OMG conducted two focus groups and a number of individual client interviews both in person at a site where DIP clients were already congregated, and over the phone.

To increase the odds of focus group participation, OMG provided dinner at the focus group after normal work hours and ten dollars for each participant. We also coordinated focus groups at the site of WIPs that hosted programs for these clients to ensure clients were familiar with the locations.

OMG selected a WIP we had interviewed for the first focus group that had three different programs and many clients. This WIP supported the idea of the focus group and was interested in tracking client progress internally, but did not have the capacity to do so; at one point they administered a survey to record client feedback and shared the limited responses with OMG. OMG called every client associated with that WIP from a full list provided by Wireless Philadelphia until at least 10 people agreed to participate in the focus group (our actual target size was six to eight people). This took 150 phone calls; 29 percent had no answer but was left a message, 31 percent had bad or wrong numbers, 11 percent agreed to participate in the first focus group, 14 percent had no answer with no answering machine or voicemail available, 9 percent had busy numbers, 2 percent hung up on the caller, and 4 percent refused to participate. Despite making confirmation calls to each person who agreed to participate, only two people showed up to the focus group.

One client who received a message from OMG was interested in participating in a focus group, but called us back after the focus group date passed, so we conducted an additional formal interview with her and sent her a ten dollar gift card as a thank you for her participation.

For the second focus group, OMG selected a WIP we had interviewed who was willing to be involved with the recruitment of clients to participate. The WIP's program manager took the lead on contacting clients and leveraging her knowledge and network of clients who she felt would be reliable and interested in participating. Six people participated in the focus group, which lasted approximately one hour and fifteen minutes.

OMG team members also attended a Wireless Philadelphia drop in session for reconfiguring their equipment on August 7, 2008 to do individual or group interviews in a location clients were already expected to visit. At this location clients were able to reconfigure their equipment to work after EarthLink ended the partnership. OMG formally interviewed the two clients who showed up at this site between 4:00 - 7:00 p.m. These clients were also given ten dollars each for their participation.

Finally, as clients were contacted to request participation in the first focus group, OMG conducted four brief informal interviews with clients who were not willing to participate in the focus groups, but were willing to give their overall thoughts about their experience with Wireless Philadelphia over the phone.

Overall, we collected qualitative information from 15 clients; seven associated with the Metropolitan Career Center, one with Impact Services, one with the Mayor's Office of Ex-Offender Reentry, and six associated with TURN. The focus group and client interview questions were designed to capture client experiences including DIP bundle use, satisfaction, and opinions about the Wireless Philadelphia services offered in conjunction with their WIP program. It should be noted that WP often distributed its service package towards the end of the clients' program obligations, This contributed to difficulties with ongoing client contact; however, this target population is also notoriously transient and thus is a difficult population with which to conduct ongoing research. See Appendix E for the client focus group/interview guide.

## Appendix B. Effective Practice Sources

### Interviewees

- Chair of Digital Inclusion Task Force, City of Minneapolis
- Project Director Digital Inclusion Programs, City of San Francisco
- Project Director of Unwire Portland, City of Portland
- Research Director of Wireless Future Program, New America Foundation
- Program Manager, Smart Riverside
- Board Member, NYC Wireless
- Chief Operating Officer, Boston Digital Bridge Foundation
- VP Digital Inclusion, One Economy
- Manager, Community Technology Program, City of Seattle
- Executive Director, San Diego Futures Foundation
- Associate Director of Research, PEW Center for Internet and American Life

### Literature

Baldassare, M., Bonner, D., Paluch, J., & Petek, S. (2008). Californians & information technology: PPIC 2008 Statewide Survey. Public Policy Institute of California.

**Retrieved July 15, 2008, from**

**[http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/survey/S\\_608MBS.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/survey/S_608MBS.pdf)**

DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Celeste, C., & Shafer, S. (2004). From unequal access to differentiated use: A literature review and agenda for research on digital inequality.

**Retrieved July 15, 2008, from <http://www.eszter.com/research/pubs/dimaggio-et-al-digitalinequality.pdf>**

Robertson, A., Soopramanien, D., & Fildes, R. (2007). Household technology acceptance heterogeneity in computer adoption. **Retrieved July 15, 2008, from**

**<http://www.lums.lancs.ac.uk/publications/viewpdf/004682/>**

Michalchik, V., Carriere, S., Emery, D.K., Gallagher, L., House, A., Molina, A., et al. (2006). One economy digital communities: Transforming lives for low-income Americans in San Jose and Miami. **Retrieved July 15, 2008, from <http://www.one-economy.com/sites/all/files/SRI-Digital-Communities-Miami-SJ-Eval-2-06.pdf>**

Environmental Health and Social Policy Center. (2002, May). Sustainability strategies for community technology centers in Seattle. Seattle, WA: O'Malley, G., & Liebow, E.

## Appendix C Stakeholder Interviewees

1. Councilwoman Blondell Reynolds Brown's Office
2. Mayor's Office of Community Services
3. Department of Behavioral Health
4. Free Library of Philadelphia
5. Knight Center of Digital Excellence
6. Fairmount Ventures
7. VKG
8. Shire Pharmaceuticals
9. YouthBuild
10. Neighborhoods Now
11. Institute for Study of Civic Values
12. People's Emergency Center
13. Metropolitan Career Center
14. Special Needs Housing
15. Nueva Esperanza EARN
16. MAST Community Charter School
17. Congreso
18. MOCS - Fatherhood Initiative
19. Philadelphia Workforce Investment Board
20. Impact Services
21. Media Mobilizing Project
22. William Penn Foundation
23. Philadelphia OIC
24. Wireless Philadelphia Staff and Board Members

## Appendix D. Interview Protocols

### Interview Guide for City/State Agency Officials

- Tell us about your role and responsibilities at \_\_\_\_\_.
- Tell us about your connection with Wireless Philadelphia.  
*(Probe: nature of/interest in relationship, when and why developed, experience over time)*
- What is your understanding of the goal and implementation of the Digital Inclusion Program to date?  
  
-In your opinion, what have been the major strengths and challenges of implementing the DIP? *(Probe: external influences and internal program and organizational factors)*
- What impact would you say the Digital Inclusion Program has had so far?  
*(Probe: leave open 'impact on what' or 'impact on whom' for their interpretation, if they ask for clarity rephrase to: Have you heard of or observed any specific outcomes of the program? What were they?)*  
  
-How significant would you say the outcomes of the DIP have been? Please explain.
- Moving forward, do you think it makes sense to continue this work? Why, why not?  
  
-Why is this work important to the city? How is this program unique? *(probe: hardware distribution, etc...)*  
  
-Assuming the programmatic aspects can be disentangled from the Internet provider, are there elements that can be continued that would add up to a sound program? Please explain.  
  
-What types of modifications would need to take place for the continuation of the Digital Inclusion Program to be advisable?
- In the future, what short and long term outcomes would you like to see from Wireless Philadelphia and the DIP?
- Is there any additional information you'd like to share with us that might help inform future planning for the Digital Inclusion Program?

**Interview Guide for Effective Practice Interviewees**

- Tell us about your role and responsibilities at \_\_\_\_\_.
- How familiar are you with Wireless Philadelphia.  
*(Probe: history with EarthLink, press, etc.)*
- How would you define Digital Inclusion as a field of work or issue to be targeted?  
*(Probe: How does the field generally describe this work?)*
- How would you describe the state of digital inclusion work in the United States?  
*(Probe: scale and types of projects, enough being done, not enough, crisis, etc.)*
- Who are the major players or institutional stakeholders in digital inclusion work nationally?  
*(Probe: Funders, nonprofits, corporations, ISP's )*
- What are some examples of best practices in digital inclusion work in the United States?
  - What scale do these projects work on (national, local, campus, neighborhood, county, state, etc.)?
  - What are the necessary roles and components of these projects?
  - What outcomes have these organizations pointed to as measures for success?
- How would rate the approach of Municipal Wi-Fi as a digital inclusion strategy?
- What technology or technologies would you say are best suited for digital inclusion work.  
*(i.e., Wi-Fi, versus Wi-Max, versus Wi-Mesh, versus Dial-up, versus DSL, versus Cable, versus Satellite, versus Fiber Optics, etc.)*
- Is there any additional information you'd like to share with us that might help inform future planning for the Digital Inclusion Program?

## Interview Guide for Technical Assistance Providers

- Tell us about your role and responsibilities at \_\_\_\_\_.
- Tell us about your connection with Wireless Philadelphia, including the nature of your relationship and when it was developed.
  - Please list all the services you have provided for Wireless Philadelphia to date. *(Probe: number of laptops to date if applicable)*
  - How often do you provide these services and to whom? *(Probe: WP staff, clients, WIPs- any changes over time)*
  - Tell us about how you deliver these services. *(Probe: Role of WP staff, clients, others- any changes over time)*
- What is your understanding of the goal and implementation of the Digital Inclusion Program to date?
  - In your opinion, what have been the major strengths and challenges of implementing the DIP? *(Probe: external influences and internal program/organizational factors)*
  - In your direct experience, what aspects of working with WP have you found most challenging? Most rewarding?
- What impact would you say the Digital Inclusion Program has had so far? *(Probe: leave open 'impact on what' or 'impact on whom' for their interpretation, if they ask for clarity rephrase to: Have you heard of or observed any specific outcomes of the program? What were they?)*
  - How significant would you say the outcomes of the DIP have been? Please explain.
  - Do you have any data you can share with us illustrating these outcomes?
- Moving forward, do you think it makes sense to continue this work? Why, why not?
  - Assuming the programmatic aspects can be disentangled from the Internet provider, are there elements that can be continued that would add up to a sound program? Please explain.
  - What types of modifications would need to take place for the continuation of the Digital Inclusion Program to be advisable?
- In the future, what short and long term outcomes would you like to see from Wireless Philadelphia and the DIP?
- Is there any additional information you'd like to share with us that might help inform future planning for the Digital Inclusion Program?

## Interview Guide for WIPs

### 1.) Background Information

- Please tell us about your roles and responsibilities at \_\_\_\_\_.  
How long have you been with \_\_\_\_\_?

### 2.) About your organization and use of Wireless

- How long have you been affiliated with Wireless Philadelphia and what is your current relationship? (*probe: why developed, when, details of process and relationship over time*)
- Tell us about the services Wireless Philadelphia provides you as a WIP.  
What implementation support did WP receive from you?
- Please describe the state of your wireless program and how you have implemented it into your programming, e.g. current programs, plans.
  - Do you have “benchmarks” for each program? E.g. What do clients have to do to be eligible for a laptop?
    - What impact if any did the DIP bundles have on clients in terms of their motivation to complete the targeted benchmarks?
    - What has been your experience regarding training programs
- Did you have target number for bundle distribution? How many have you distributed so far?
  - Can you tell us a bit about your distribution process?
- Once individuals receive a service bundle, how do you maintain the relationship over time? What challenges, if any, exist in staying engaged with clients for the purposes of providing ongoing support and assessment of post-receipt outcomes?
- What aspects of WP’s DIP implementation support do you find most useful? (*probe: what about their hardware component?*) In what ways do you feel WP’s support might be lacking?
- Based on your experience with WP, what are their organizational strengths and challenges? (*probe: internal/external → WIP capacity, partners, city, national, users, network infrastructure, network ownership and plan*)
- How or in what ways has the switch to free network access changed your program?

### 3.) Client Experience

- What are some of the benefits that your clients have received through your wireless related programs?
- What are some of the challenges that clients are reporting?
- We want to get a sense of any data you have collected in reference to the DIP (*probe: technology/data programs, user info*)
  - What data is collected and how is it used? (*probe: reporting to funders, marketing/PR, ways of knowing DIP impact, adaptability*)
- Do you have suggestions for how client needs can be met more effectively?

### 4.) Looking Ahead

- Moving forward, how would you like to see your relationship with Wireless Philadelphia improved to better meet your program goals?

## Appendix E. Focus Group Guide

### Wireless Philadelphia Client Focus Group/Interview Guide

- a. OMG Intro
- b. Your responses are confidential and all of your answers will be used in aggregate—no specific names will be used in the report.
- c. Please speak one at a time – so that we can capture everyone’s ideas fully.
- d. Feel free to respond or not respond to all questions.

#### 1.) Demographics (filled in by observation)

# of attendees			
Gender	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	
Approx. age	<b>18-25</b>	<b>26-34</b>	<b>35+</b>
Prior experience with computers	Little	Some	A lot
Prior experience with Internet			

#### 2.) Introduction to and experience with Wireless Philadelphia

- How did you find out about Wireless Philadelphia? (*probe: the free laptops, free internet*)
- When you first heard about the opportunity to get a laptop and Internet access, what made you pursue it? What were your thoughts about how you *would use it...?*)
- How effective was the process to receive a bundle? (*probe: who did you have to work with, how long did it take, etc...*)
  - What did you like and what might you change about the way the bundles work and laptops are given out?
- Do you still have your laptop? If not, why?
- How comfortable were you with using the laptop and the Internet after you received the training?
- Did being offered a computer change the way you felt about the program you are/were a part of? (*probe: change in motivation...?*)

#### 3.) Culture of use

- How long had you used computers before now?
  - If yes - What did you use a computer for in the past?
- How long had you gotten on the Internet before if any? What did you use it for?
- Did WP help you get on the Internet for the first time? If so, what did you use it for? What do you still use it for if you do? (*probe: websites*)
- Where do you use your Wireless Philadelphia laptop? (*probe: in the house, outside, etc.?*)
- Do others in your family use your laptop? If so, how?
- How do you get on the Internet now? (*Wireless or other*)
- Do others in your neighborhood or community have computers or the Internet?
  - What are the barriers/challenges to people getting access to the Internet?
  - How do people you know who have it use it?

- What types of ways do you communicate with others in your community using technology? (*text, IM, call*)
- Has using your computer changed you or your family's life at all? If so, how?
- Has using wireless technology changed you or your family's life at all? If so how?
- How important do you think having access to a computer and the internet is?

## Appendix F. Summary of Wireless Internet Partners (WIPS)

<b>(ALL) WIPs by Service Area</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Community/Economic Development	6	15
Education	7	17
Health/Mental Health	9	22
Housing/Homelessness	2	5
Immigration Services	1	2
Public Welfare	3	7
Social Networking	2	5
Technology	2	5
Workforce Development	6	15
Youth Development	2	5
Fatherhood	1	2
	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>WIPs Interviewed by Service Area</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Community/Economic Development	2	20
Education	2	20
Health/Mental Health	0	0
Housing/Homelessness	1	10
Immigration Services	0	0
Public Welfare	1	10
Social Networking	0	0
Technology	0	0
Workforce Development	3	30
Youth Development	0	0
Fatherhood	1	10
	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>