ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PROGRESS REPORT FOR SUSTAINABLE BROADBAND ADOPTION

General Information

1. Federal Agency and Organizational Element to Which Report is Submitted	2. Award Identification Number	3. DUNS Number
Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	55-43-B10539	080490584

4. Recipient Organization

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM 432 N LAKE ST, MADISON, WI 537061415

5. Current Reporting Period End Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	6. Is this the last Annual Report of the Award Period?
12-31-2013	(●) Yes ( ) No

7. Certification: I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is correct and complete for performance of activities for the purposes set forth in the award documents.

7a. Typed or Printed Name and Title of Certifying Official	7c. Telephone (area code, number and extension)
Carol Golisch	6088904248
Fiscal Compliance & Reports Manager	**7d. Email Address** carol.golisch@uwex.edu
7b. Signature of Certifying Official Submitted Electronically	**7e. Date Report Submitted (MM/DD/YYYY):** 06-24-2013

PROJECT INDICATORS

1. Does your Sustainable Broadband Adoption (SBA) project foster a particular broadband technology or technologies? If so, please describe this technology (or technologies) (600 words or less).

The Building Community Capacity through Sustainable Broadband Adoption project does not foster one particular broadband technology over another. While we advocate for the build out of high capacity fiber to connect the community anchor institutions, our project is about increasing the effective use of broadband by communities, residents, businesses and public and civic institutions. In looking over the past two years, the technologies most utilized by the demonstration communities and the organizations they were working with was wireless and fixed wired.

2a. Please list all of the broadband equipment and/or supplies you have purchased during the most recent calendar year using BTOP grant funds or other (matching) funds, including any customer premises equipment or end-user devices. If additional space is needed, please attach a list of equipment and/or supplies. Please also describe how the equipment and supplies have been deployed (100 words or less).

Manufacturer	Item	Unit Cost per Item	Number of Units	Narrative description of how the equipment and supplies were deployed
n/a	n/a	0	0	No equipment was deployed.
Totals		0	0	

Add Equipment | Remove Equipment

2b. To the extent you distribute equipment/supplies to beneficiaries of your project, please describe the equipment/supplies you distribute, the quantities distributed, and the specific populations to whom the equipment/supplies are distributed (600 words or less).

No equipment was distributed.

3. For SBA access and training provided with BTOP grant funds, please provide the information below. Unless otherwise indicated in the instructions, figures should be reported cumulatively from award inception to the end of the most recent calendar year. For each type of training (other than open access), please count only the participants who completed the course.

Types of Access or Training	Number of People Targeted	Number of People Participating	Total Training Hours Offered
Open Lab Access	458,885	5,634	0
Multimedia	173,975	368	606
Office Skills	45,365	105	211
ESL	0	0	0
GED	0	0	0
College Preparatory Training	0	0	0
Basic Internet and Computer Use	460,719	2,638	8,462
Certified Training Programs	0	0	0
Other (please specify): various meaningful use	130,441	6,670	14,254
Total	1,269,385	15,415	23,533

4. Please describe key economic and social successes of your project during the past year, and why you believe the project is successful thus far (600 words or less).

Key economic and social successes of our project during the past several years are gauged on several factors beyond the numbers of people reached. They fall into three categories, qualitative, utilization of resources and sustainability of effort beyond the grant.
Qualitative: All of our efforts were aimed at people, young and old, who without this endeavor would not have been exposed to the benefits of broadband and digital literacy. Although few pre- and post- surveys were implemented, across the board both verbal and written feedback informed us when we were hitting the mark or not; this feedback was backed by repeat participants and increased numbers of people attending. A key factor here is our educators being tuned into their targeted population, listening and then being nimble enough to change directions, tweak and or try something new. At times the best and most effective approach was to work with people one-on-one. Feedback from these individuals was extremely positive.
Resource Utilization: Many resources were created in the past two years and another measure of success is there continued use. We produced 12 videos on broadband needs, uses, and economic impact in Wisconsin (7,581 views)We produced three guides on local

efforts and models to increase internet access in Wisconsin communities and have distributed these widely. We utilized multiple online and social media platforms to promote and share resources, eNews, YouTube, Flickr, Delicious, SildeShare and a much visited website.
Sustainability: In looking at the five community areas that were a part of this effort, each has continued the work through additional investments in community education and outreach. In Superior, Technology Coaches within the School District have been expanded. In the Chippewa Valley, three Counties with Cooperative Extension have financially supported the Community Educator to continue on in her work to provide broadband education and outreach for the tri-county area. In Wausau, through the local United Way and an innovation grant from UWEX, the Community Educator will be training volunteers to continue to provide digital literacy training, and in Platteville the Library continues to offer classes with increased numbers. At the College of Menominee Nation, education and outreach has increased, now taking place at their new Community Technology Center.

5. Please estimate the level of broadband adoption in the community(ies) and/or area(s) your project serves, explain your methodology for estimating the level of broadband adoption, and explain changes in the broadband adoption level, if any, since the project began.

5a. Adoption Level (%):	Narrative description of level, methodology, and change from the level at project inception (600 words or less).
83	**We estimate an average adoption level of 83% in our demonstration communities which includes individuals that access broadband exclusively through smart phones. This estimate is based on initial analysis of a consumer phone survey and supported by the other components of our evaluation work including focus groups and a web survey. For the consumer phone survey we partnered with the state-wide broadband telephone survey and have paid for over-sampling in each of our five demonstration communities to yield statistically valid results for the counties that make up our demonstration communities. These baseline version of this survey was completed in early 2011. We have completed the over-sampling portion on a follow-up survey and are waiting completion of the statewide portion. This survey determined the percentage of households that subscribed to internet and the type of internet connection (DSL, cable modem, dial up, etc.). In the analysis of the baseline statewide data, adoption level was determined by excluding households with no internet or with dial-up. We have followed the same analysis to determine the adoption level in our demonstration communities.**

6. Please describe the two most common barriers to broadband adoption that you have experienced this year in connection with your project. What steps did you take to address them (600 words or less)?

The two most common barriers to adoption that we've encountered are (1) not understanding the relevancy and (2) not having access. When relevancy is a barrier non-adopters do not recognize broadband enabled technologies as having value in their individual lives. Access is a barrier when broadband is not physically available to non-adopters or they do not have the economic means to pay for broadband services.

Several residents of Northern Wisconsin commented on these barriers during interviews on needs, uses, and the economic impact of broadband in their communities. One said, "Some of my friends just, they won't even try, you know they have really no interest in learning. I think it's an age thing. You know the older people I know they really are very reluctant to start. They think they're too old to learn. And I started probably when I was early 50's. So, it's not that difficult, I don't think anymore, once you get the basic knowledge it's pretty easy." Another had this to say on her experience with a barrier in access, "I'd like to be more on the World Wide Web to really research and do other things, but like I said at this point in time, it is so slow, that for me to even bring up one little piece of information takes me hours. Otherwise, I can't use it."

Our education and outreach efforts most directly address the relevancy barrier encountered by Vern's friends. We've conducted 838 education events in our demonstration communities; 28% of these events are open lab or demonstration events where participants can receive one-on-one attention and see how a computer and broadband supports what is most important to them from connecting with far away family to information on their hobby. Another 48% of the "classes" address topics of basic computer and internet use including how to use a mouse and type, how to set up email accounts and introductions to a range of applications (Office, Facebook, Skype, etc). Preliminary results from a follow-up consumer survey indicate that more people in our demonstration communities (over 15% more) are using the Internet and their uses are becoming more sophisticated. Use of the Internet to search for jobs increased 20%, to access educational services increased 8%, to research health issues increased7%, to get news, weather, sports or financial information increased 19%, and to access social media increased 27%.

In addition, our complementary CCI grant funded project is also increasing the availability of broadband infrastructure within 4 of the 5 demonstration communities. We continue to work with private providers and communities on designing solutions aimed at improving affordable broadband options. We have most recently formed the Center for Community Technology Solutions within the University of Wisconsin Extension that will continue this work with communities.

7. To the extent that you have made any subcontracts or sub grants, please provide the number of subcontracts or sub grants that have been made to socially and economically disadvantaged small business (SDB) concerns as defined by section 8(a) of the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. 647, as modified by NTIA's adoption of an alternative small business size standard for use in BTOP. Please also provide the names of these SDB entities. (150 words or less)

No subcontracts or subgrants were made to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns.

8. Please describe any best practices / lessons learned that can be shared with other similar BTOP projects (900 words or less).

The lessons shared here represent a theme or had a large impact on the project and fall into four categories; startup, partnerships, communications and flexible delivery mechanisms.

Start-up: Working with five different community areas certainly taught us that no one size fits all when it comes to providing valuable and high impact broadband education and outreach. But what was apparent very early on was the need a local champion and local educator/project manager with established connections and dedicated time. In one community where this was not the case, we struggled in getting the program off the ground. With the right individual taking the lead, local partnerships are much easier to establish and new partnerships can be fostered. Additionally, it cannot be stated strong enough, start-up takes time. If you think two months, double it. Educators struggled initially to know what their education outreach programs should look like. A lot of trial and error was needed to figure it out.

Partnerships: We relied heavily on both statewide partners as well as local partnerships in each of the five community areas. Several keys to partnerships that work: first choosing them well and building strong trusting relationships. Questions to ask include what are we unable to accomplish that they can? And then be bold in asking. We also learned the importance of having face-to-face time with folks, time to know who each other are and develop a joint vision for the combined effort as well as their local initiative. With these trusted relationships we were able to tackle challenges and obstacles along the way. Partnerships should include a wide variety of organizations, including local and state legislators who can be champions for the effort.

Communications: Our lesson learned, you can never communicate too much and mechanisms to do so need to be on multiple platforms. We used a range of offline and online outreach and communications tools to reach a wide range of audiences. For example, some of our outreach educators went door to door to promote their offerings; we used backpack mail, fliers in the grocery stores and cafes; digital signage in the libraries, etc. to reach class participants. We used eNews, website, Flickr and YouTube to reach audiences both inside and outside of UW-Extension. We used our Delicious and Twitter accounts to support out outreach educators, to reach audiences in our demo communities who were online, and to connect successfully with media. Consistency is also important, particularly in online promotion; for example, using the same keywords or tags across multiple online portals will help increase SEO.

Flexible Delivery Mechanisms: Flexibility is a key word here, as well as consistency once the delivery mechanism that works is found. As mentioned earlier, this required trial and error in each of the community areas. We clearly learned that the best education and outreach offerings were the once that went out to the people we were trying to reach. At those events or classes, participants were more receptive and attendance was increased. We also learned that the best teaching techniques were to coach or guide from alongside rather than instruct from out-front. All in all, this required flexibility on the part of community educators throughout.