Survey Research Operations

Monthly Project Report

Sponsored Projects

February 2017

Sponsored Projects

(ABCD) Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development
(A-STARRS LS) Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study
(DMACS) Detroit Metropolitan Area Survey
(HCAP 2016) Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol
(HRS 2016) Health and Retirement Study
(HCDC, H&C) Housing & Children
(MTTS) Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study
(MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illume Web 2016) Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot
(MTF Tablet Pilot) MTF Base Year Tablet Pilot
(NSFG 2010-2020) National Survey of Family Growth
(AHRB) Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior
(YRS) Optimizing Youth Suicide Risk Screening and Triage In the Emergency Department
(PSID-WB) PSID Wellbeing
(SN&WB) Social Networks and Well Being
(SWEL) Stress and Wellbeing in Everyday Life
(SCA 2017) Surveys of Consumer Attitudes

Project Name	Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD)
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed Secondary: Mixed Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	**Direct Budget:** 277,805.00 **InDirect Budget:** 0.00 **Total Budget:** 430,596.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Mary Heitzeg (UM Dept of Psychiatry)
Funding Agency	NIH
IRB	**HUM#:** HUM00106316 **Period Of Approval:** 9/10/2015-1/7/2017
Project Team	**Project Lead:** Karin Schneider
	Budget Analyst: Janelle P Cramer
	Production Manager: _UnAssigned
	Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul
	Production Manager: _UnAssigned
	Production Manager: _UnAssigned
Proposal #:	no data
Description:	ABCD is a longitudinal study of about 10,000 children from ages 9-10 through early adulthood to assess factors that influence individual brain development trajectories and functional outcomes. UM Dept of Psychiatry is one of 19 research sites across the country.

Sampling statisticians from our Stat and Methods Unit identified all public and private schools with children aged 9-10 within the geographic catchment area for each site. This activity was under a separate contract and the initial selection of four replicates has been distributed to all research sites. SRO received an electronic data file listing all selected schools in the UM catchment area.

SRO will target the recruitment of 54 schools from Michigan, who will consent to distribute recruitment letters to parents for participation in the ABCD study. Respondent contact information will be returned directly to the Michigan research team for additional activities, including screening for eligibility. (Parents return cards with their contact information directly to the PI's staff.)

SRO Project Period	05/2016 - 03/2018
Data Col Period	05/2016 - 02/2018
Security Plan	NA
Milestone Dates	

PreProduction Start:	05/15/2016	**Pretest Start:**	
Pretest End:		**Recruitment Start:**	05/20/2016
Staffing Completed:	05/20/2016	**GIT Start:**	
SS Train Start:		**SS Train End:**	
DC Start:	05/20/2016	**DC End:**	02/28/2018

Other Project Team Members:	
Other Project Names:	Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development
Sample Mgmt Sys	NA
Data Col Tool	NA
Hardware	NA
DE Software	NA
QC Recording Tool	NA
Incentive	NA
Administration	NA
Payment Type	NA
Payment Method	NA

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (ABCD) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	On Track
Monthly Update	Our school-level response rate is still good, but we are at a plateau -- 54 schools recruited (100% of our goal), while the individual-level response is still low -- we have yet to reach 5% response rate (the number of completed/scheduled

clinic visits given 5000+ parent packets that have been distributed).

We expect a new replicate in the next few days.

Special Issues

Cost
Feb 08, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	105,185.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	430,596.00
Total Budget:	430,596.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Feb 08, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	54		
Goal at Completion:	54		
Current actual:	54		
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study (A-STARRS LS)
Project Mode	Primary: Web Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 3
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	**Direct Budget:** 8,218,215.00 **InDirect Budget:** 4,520,018.00 **Total Budget:** 12,738,233.00

Principal Investigator/Client	James Wagner (University of Michigan) Robert Ursano (Uniformed Services University of the Health Scienc) Murray Stein (University of California San Diego)
Funding Agency	Department of Defense
IRB	**HUM#:** HUM00099203 **Period Of Approval:** 2/18/2016-2/17/2017
Project Team	**Project Lead:** Nancy J Gebler
	Budget Analyst: William Lokers
	Production Manager: Ruth B Philippou
	Senior Project Advisor: Mary P Maher
	Production Manager: Meredith A House
	Production Manager: Margaret Lee Hudson

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	This project is a continuation of the Army STARRS study (Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers). For STARRS LS, we will attempt to reinterview all respondents form the All Army Study (AAS), New Soldier Study (NSS) and Pre-Post Deployment Study (PPDS) samples using a web-phone multi mode study. Each of the approximately 70,000 eligible respondents will be invited to participate once every two years. In addition to reinterviewing the AAS, NSS and PPDS samples; STARRS LS will continue to maintain and support the Research Data Enclave, allowing members of the research team and collaborators to analyze primary Army STARRS data as well as de-identified historical administrative data received from the Army and Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, STARRS LS will continue to receive and link de-identified administrative data to the survey data (from the original Army STARRS data collection as well as STARRS LS surveys). These data will also be made available in the Research Data Enclave.

SRO Project Period	02/2015 - 11/2019
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 11/2019
Security Plan	NA

Milestone Dates		
PreProduction Start: 02/01/2015		**Pretest Start:** 10/14/2015
Pretest End: 03/31/2016		**Recruitment Start:**
Staffing Completed:		**GIT Start:**
SS Train Start:		**SS Train End:**
DC Start: 09/12/2016		**DC End:** 09/30/2019

Other Project Team Members:	Andrew Hupp, Heather Schroeder, Leah Roberts, Ryan Yoder, Andrew Piskowrowski, Lisa Lewandowski-Romps, Lamont Manley, Emily Blaczyk, Genise Pattulo, Derek Dubuque, Keith Liebetreu
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	MSMS
Data Col Tool	Blaise 5
Hardware	Desktop
DE Software	N/A
QC Recording Tool	Live monitoring
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Check, post ($50-$100); Cash, prepaid ($2 (or Challenge coin)); Other (Army STARRS challenge coin (provide
Payment Method	Check through other system (MSMS); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (MSMS); Other (Army STA

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (A-STARRS LS) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns
Monthly Update	Activities for February 2017 include: Project Management and Planning: • We continued production data collection through the month. We are sending production updates to the PIs twice weekly, and report on production progress each week on the call with the Army/ODUSA. • Work with the ODUSA on safety plan and address lookup activities continues to go smoothly.

• We continue to work with Harvard University to review results and update the cost and response rate assumptions used in the current contact protocol. We submitted a proposed data collection timeline for the remainder of the project, and updated sample and cost spreadsheets designed to assist in the monitoring progress and planning for future data collection adjustments.

• We reviewed and provided comments on the Year 3 subaward documentation, in anticipation of receiving a funding award for Year 3 (which began December 1).

• We met with Michigan and USUHS IRB representatives to discuss the secondary review process surrounding a reported protocol deviation with respect to the safety plan. The report is scheduled to be discussed at a March 1 board meeting at Michigan.

• We prepared a draft calendar for data collection activities for the remainder of the project period (see Table 1 below)

Table 1: Proposed Data Collection Calendar

Wave 1 data collection	Date	Notes
Replicate 1 released	9/12/16	Release replicates every other Monday
Replicate 33 released	12/25/2017	Will need to adjust Dec 25 release date
Replicate 33 completed	2/14/2018	Assumes 7 week data collection per replicate
Months of data collection	17	

Wave 2 preparation	Start	End
Instrument finalized	9/15/2017	10/15/2017
Instrument program, test	10/15/2017	12/15/2017
Contact protocol finalized	10/1/2017	11/1/2017
System program, test	11/1/2017	12/15/2017
Prepare Wave 2 sample	11/15/2017	12/15/2017
Final testing, loading	1/1/2018	1/15/2018

Wave 2 data collection	Date	Notes
Replicate 1 released	2/1/2018	Overlap with Wave 1 to keep interviewer work steady
Last replicate released	8/1/2019	
Last replicate completed	9/30/2019	Assumes 7 week data collection per replicate
Post production	10/1/2019	Final data loading, documentation
Year 5 ends	11/30/2019	
Months of data collection	20	

Enclave and User Support:

• Members of the Enclave IT team continued to maintain security requirements for the Enclave hardware.

• We are preparing to replace a server that has reached the end of its useful life. The cost estimate was submitted to HJF and approved, and we are in the process of purchasing the equipment. We anticipate having the hardware set up and approved for use by the Army in approximately three months.

• Background check and Flux user access requests have been processed throughout the month.

• Annual training renewal updates were tracked, and reminders were sent to the small number of individuals who have not yet completed the required training.

• The enclave team continues to answer user questions and process data transfer requests as needed; and continues to receive, track and process requests for new software and license renewals as needed.

• We continue to support the analysis teams using the Army STARRS data.

• We loaded the first batch of STARRS-LS survey data into the Enclave on February 24. This contained data from completed and started interviews from the first six sample replicates.

• We participated in the webinar on the use of the STARRS public use data on February 9, 2017. A total of 65 individuals participated. The slides and recording of the webinar are posted on the ICPSR website.

Data Collection Progress and Plans:

• As of February 28, the production statistics are as follows:
o Replicates released: 1-11, with a total of 21,510 sample lines
o Completed Web main interviews: 4,215
o Completed CATI main interviews: 665
o Completed End Game interviews: 23 (19 Web, 4 IVR)
• Table 2 below provides the current release timeline for sample replicates 8-11.

Table 2: Timelines for Current and Upcoming Sample Replicates

	Repl. 8	Repl. 9	Repl. 10	Repl. 11
Phase 1 (letter, coin)	1/9 - 1/15	1/23 - 1/29	2/6 - 2/12	2/20-2/26
Phase 2 (email, text)	1/16 - 1/31	1/30 - 2/14	2/13 – 3/1 #	2/27-3/14
Phase 3 ($50/$100, telephone calls)*	2/1 - 2/17	2/15 - 3/3	3/2 – 3/17 #	3/15-3/31
Phase 4 ($100, letters, phone calls)**	2/18 – 2/28	3/4 - 3/14	3/18 – 3/28	4/1-4/11

Replicates 1-7 are complete.
* Replicates 8-9 offer all participants $50 at Phase 3. For Replicates 10-22 we will implement an experiment offering $50 and $100 at Phase 3.
**Phase 4 will send email, and make phone calls for all participants (no letters) starting with Replicate 8.
#Replicate 10: Phase 2 is extended by one day and Phase 3 shortened by one day; to implement this change with the release of the Production 2 version of the instrument.

• Starting with Replicate #4, we are subselecting a random 50% of the remaining active cases at the end of Phase 2. Those cases will be closed out with no further contact. The other half of the sample will be followed up in Phases 3 and 4. This is being done to keep our data collection costs within budget.
• We provided Harvard with updated cost and response rate information. Based on the results of the Phase 4 experiment, we began putting all Phase 4 cases through option 4b (making telephone calls, and not sending letters) starting with Replicate 7.
• We also worked with Harvard to develop and plan for another experiment with incentive amounts which will be implemented on March 2 when Replicate 10 enters Phase 3 of the contact protocol. In this experiment, half of the Phase 3 sample will be offered $50 and half will be offered $100; to help determine how early in the process we should offer the increased incentive.
• We are currently working on plans for a new end game design which will be discussed in the coming weeks.
• We have increased the number of new interviewers we will be training in April to cover the added scope of calling Phase 3 and Phase 4 cases; and to replace interviewers who have left the project.
• Tables 3-5 below show response rate by phase as of February 28. Table 3 provides final results for sample replicates #1-5, which are complete and include the first set of design experiments. Table 4 provides results for sample replicates #6-9, which include the second (Phase 4) design experiment. Table 5 includes initial results for sample replicates 10-11, which will include the third (Phase 3) design experiment.

Table 3: Response Rate by Replicate and Phase, as of 26 January 2017: Replicates 1-5*

	Goals	Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5
Replicate Launch Date		12-Sep	26-Sep	10-Oct	24-Oct	7-Nov
Sample Size	1,006	1,000	1,000	2,313	2,313	
Total Interviews		396	342	334	568	622
Cumulative Wtd Resp Rate		44.8%	39.2%	33.4%	33.7%	35.9%
Completion Rates by Phase*						
Phase 1 (letter, coin)	2%	2.9%	2.6%	1.7%	2.0%	1.6%
Phase 2 (email, text msg)	12%	13.8%	12.6%	13.3%	13.8%	16.2%
Phase 3a ($100, no calls)	15%	11.6%	13.2%	12.7%	10.5%	12.1%
Phase 3b ($50, calls)	15%	16.2%	15.2%	13.6%	13.7%	13.2%
Phase 3c ($100, calls)	25%	23.5%	17.1%	18.9%	22.0%	21.4%
Phase 4a ($100, calls)	15%	18.9%	13.1%	14.6%	11.7%	11.3%
Phase 4b ($100, no calls)	15%	9.5%	7.0%	5.6%	6.3%	8.2%
Phase 4c ($100, no calls)	0%	2.7%	2.6%	3.5%	3.6%	4.8%
Phase 5	15%	10.7%	7.9%	Phase 5 discontinued		

*Replicates 1-5 are complete. Phase completion rates are conditional (% completes of cases in that phase)

Table 4: Response Rate by Replicate and Phase as of 28 February 2017: Replicates 6-9*

	Rep 6*	Rep 7*	Rep 8	Rep 9
Replicate Launch Date		21-Nov	5-Dec	9-Jan	23-Jan
Sample Size	2,313	2,313	2,313	2,313
Total Interviews		584	566	616	396
Cumulative Wtd Resp Rate		34.5%	34.9%	35.8% #	19.7% #
Completion Rates by Phase*				
Phase 1 (letter, coin)	1.6%	0.9%	2.4%	2.6%
Phase 2 (email, text msg)	15.0%	13.7%	15.8%	12.2%
Phase 3 ($50, calls)	13.5%	16.1%	13.5%	6.2%
Phase 4a ($100 letter, calls)	12.1%	11.1%		
Phase 4a ($100 no letter, calls)	13.5%	11.2%		
Phase 4b ($100, letter, no calls)**	7.0%	5.6%	9.6% #	3.1% #
Phase 4c ($100, no letter, no calls)	5.4%	9.5%		

  *Replicates 6-7 are complete. Phase completion rates are conditional (% completes in that phase)
  **Replicates 8 and 9 Phase 4 cases were assigned to treatment 4b
  # Replicates 8 and 9 still being worked; phase not complete

Table 5: Response Rate by Replicate and Phase as of 28 February 2017: Replicates 10-11

	Rep 10	Rep 11
Replicate Launch Date	6-Feb	20-Feb
Sample Size	2,313	2,313

Total Interviews   383 96
Cumulative Wtd Resp Rate   16.6% #   4.2% #
Completion Rates by Phase*
Phase 1 (letter, coin)   2.9%   2.8%
Phase 2 (email, text msg)   14.0% # 2.0% #
Phase 3a ($50, calls)
Phase 3b ($100, calls)
Phase 4 ($100, calls)
*Phase completion rates are conditional (% completes in that phase)
Replicates 10 and 11 still being worked; phase not complete

• We continue to coordinate safety plan follow-ups with the Army and the Michigan clinicians. Table 6 below provides safety plan counts and rates as of 28 February.

Table 6: Safety Plan Checks as of 28 February

	# Started Interview (N)	# of Completed Interviews	Safety Plan Checks	% of starts
Michigan Clinicians	1,943	1,829	326	16.8%
Army Chaplains	3,314	3,075	199	6.0%
End Game IVR, manually processed	8	6	1	12.5%
Total Sample	5,265	4,910	526	10.0%

Cost Report:
Our estimate of current costs, and a preliminary cost-to-complete projection by task and project year is shown in Table 7 below. We spent a total of $308,865 in January 2017 on data collection, production support, project management, data management and reporting, and enclave support. We are currently projecting a deficit of $440, 328 for the total project (3.5% of the total budget), leaving our projected total cost essentially unchanged from last month's report. We will continue to evaluate the results of the sample releases currently being worked and will work with Harvard to refine our sample design and contact protocols to bring our total costs for the five-year project period within the total available budget. We continue to work on costs in all categories to bring our total cost projections within the budgeted amount.

Our cost estimates for Wave 2 (the second interview, to be conducted in Years 4-5 of this project) are still very preliminary. We have begun working with Harvard to specify on the timeline, scope and data collection design for Wave 2. As decisions are made, we will update our cost projections accordingly.

Table 7: STARRS LS Cost Report for January 2017

	Pre & Post Production*	Data Collection**	Project Management	Enclave and User Support	Grand Total
Year 1 Budget	$570,566	$55,702	$247,428	$245,622	$1,119,318
Actual Year 1 Costs	$503,866	$18,789	$295,639	$223,616	$1,041,910
Variance	$66,700	$36,913	($48,211)	$22,006	$77,408
Year 2 Budget	$574,123	$1,976,966	$462,928	$618,848	$3,632,865
Actual Year 2 Costs	$930,775	$515,665	$436,499	$469,847	$2,352,786
Variance	($356,652)	$1,461,301	$26,429	$149,001	$1,280,079
Year 3 Budget	$400,008	$1,981,395	$476,249	$603,408	$3,461,060
Actual cost through Dec 16	$58,684	$184,900	$32,300	$28,370	$304,253
Actual cost for Jan 2017	$62,467	$181,162	$37,481	$27,755	$308,865
Projected cost Feb-Nov 17	$429,980	$2,236,716	$395,175	$507,299	$3,569,169
Total Year 3 cost	$551,131	$2,602,778	$464,956	$563,423	$4,182,287
Variance	($151,123)	($621,383)	$11,293	$39,985	($721,227)
Year 4 Budget	$280,594	$1,055,329	$410,278	$654,463	$2,400,664
Year 4 Projected Total Cost	$348,873	$1,499,965	$428,101	$675,841	$2,952,779
Variance	($68,279)	($444,636)	($17,823)	($21,378)	($552,115)
Year 5 Budget	$263,619	$805,264	$418,806	$636,637	$2,124,326
Year 5 Projected Total Cost	$332,168	$1,240,228	$437,298	$639,104	$2,648,798
Variance	($68,549)	($434,964)	($18,492)	($2,467)	($524,472)
Total Budget	$2,088,910	$5,874,656	$2,015,689	$2,758,978	$12,738,233
Total Projected Cost at Completion	$2,666,813	$5,877,425	$2,062,492	$2,571,831	$13,178,561
Total Variance	($577,903)	($2,769)	($46,803)	$187,147	($440,328)

*Includes costs for the pilot, totaling $134,000.
**Data Collection costs for Wave 1 are primarily in Years 1-3; and Wave 2 are Years 4-5.

Special Issues	Areas of Risk, Mitigation Strategies:

We continue to track several areas of risk, and develop mitigation strategies.
- Respondent contact and participation.
  o We calculated contact and cooperation rates from the first six sample releases, and are finding that the participant rate is high, but our rate of making contact with respondents is lower than we would like.
  o We are working on options for improving our contact rate, and plan to design some experiments in a new design for Phase 5 end game activities to test the effectiveness of these options. We plan to implement the new end game design in May or June of this year.
  o We worked with Harvard to evaluate the results of the Phase 4 experiments and decided to add another set of experiments in Phase 3, to determine the optimal time to offer the increased incentive. These will be implemented for sample replicates 10 and 11.
  o We investigated options for sending additional text messages that are compliant with TCPA regulations, and are planning to send a second text message in the end game protocol.
  o Approval to receive batch address updates from DEERS has been requested, and a Memo of Understanding is being prepared by the ODUSA. In the meantime, we are submitting sample lists to the ODUSA for manual look-ups prior to the release of each sample replicate.
  o We are also requesting the ODUSA work with DMDC to submit a small number of cases through their systems for the end game sample to evaluate what the added contact information may do to help increase our contact rate.
- New technical systems.
  o Our technical systems are performing well and we have worked out most of the major bugs. We continue to work on upgrades to our technical systems to increase efficiency and lower our project expenses.
  o A new version of the Blaise software has been released, and we are evaluating what impact (if any) this might have on our Wave 2 instrument development and programming costs.
- Costs/Financing
  o We have updated our cost projections with the assumption in the current design, and are working with Harvard to adjust the subsampling rates and contact protocol as needed to ensure that we stay within budget. Cost projections will be updated as we continue to adjust the study design and scope.
  o The scope for Wave 2 data collection has not been finalized. We have a place holder for Wave 2 costs and will need to re-evaluate those assumptions as we finalize the scope and cost estimates for the remainder of Wave 1 data collection.
  o Year 3 of our award began December 1. As of January 26, we have not received the Year 3 award from Henry M. Jackson Foundation. We are continuing to work, with the understanding that we can use the approximately $1.2 Million unused funds from the Year 2 award to cover our current Year 3 expenses.

Cost
Feb 15, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	4,007,814.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	13,178,561.00
Total Budget:	12,738,233.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-440,328.00
Reason For Variance:	We adjusted the data collection scope assumptions to reflect our current contact protocol for Wave 1 and current staffing needs for data management, reporting, and MSMS. While MSMS is starting to stabilize, we are still working with slow response times and continue to prioritize our requests for features and utilities that would make the system easier and less costly to use. We continue to adjust our projections on a monthly basis, and will keep our variance at or near zero by the time the project ends.

Projections
Feb 15, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	395,921.00
Actual Dollars Used:	308,865.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	87,056.00
Reason For Variance:	The bulk of this month's under-run is due to respondent payments coming in lower than projected. We moved unused funds forward to future months, so the total project cost remains unchanged.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

For this project, we have response rate and interview count goals for each of the five phases in our contact protocol. The sample is released in replicates and we are tracking results by phase and replicate. Tracking information is included in the Monthly updates panel above.

Project Name	Detroit Metropolitan Area Survey (DMACS)				
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		**Project Status**	Current	
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 233,426.00	***InDirect Budget:*** 23,343.00		***Total Budget:***	256,769.00

Principal Investigator/Client
Jeff Morenoff (Population Studies)
Elisabeth Gerber

Funding Agency Kresge Foundation

IRB ***HUM#:*** 00112364 ***Period Of Approval:*** 2/25/2017

Project Team	***Project Lead:***	Joseph Matthew Matuzak
	Budget Analyst:	Dean E Stevens
	Production Manager:	Bridgitte Wyche McGee
	Senior Project Advisor:	Kirsten Haakan Alcser
	Production Manager:	Joseph Matthew Matuzak
	Production Manager:	Bridgitte Wyche McGee

Proposal #: no data

Description: The Detroit Metropolitan Area Communities Study (DMACS) seeks to provide an information and innovation platform for conducting research and supporting evidence-based decisions about community investments and public policy. DMACS will be built around a representative web-based panel survey of adult residents of the four-county Metro Detroit region of Southeast Michigan, including Macomb, Oakland, Washtenaw and Wayne Counties, and the City of Detroit. Panel members are to be drawn from diverse communities and will reflect the region's full range of population characteristics, including respondents from traditionally underserved and/or underrepresented groups such as: people with low incomes, education or literacy; those with physical or cognitive disabilities; recent migrants; the elderly; and young adults. When fully implemented, the survey sample will include approximately 2,000 adult residents, selected and recruited based on best scientific practices (ie a probability sample), including representative subsamples of approximately 1,000 Detroit residents and 1,000 adults living throughout the metropolitan area. It is envisioned that panel members will complete a 15-20 minute web-based survey each quarter (i.e., four per year) plus additional short surveys as situations and opportunities arise. The core content on the quarterly DMACS surveys will include questions that ask citizens to prioritize the needs of their community and aspects they would most like to see change (e.g., with regard to crime, business development, jobs, education, housing, transportation, health care, and the environment). It will also monitor trends in citizens' views of changes to their community and the wider region, which groups are benefitting (or being hurt) the most from those changes, views on inequality and its sources and consequences, and the degree of civic engagement in local communities. This core content will provide a clear, nuanced and unprecedented portrait of the people and communities that make up our changing region.

DMACS will also provide the infrastructure to allow shorter surveys on specific questions as they arise, as well as to investigate in greater depth specific issues that affect a particular neighborhood, municipality or portion of the region. In the case of short topical surveys, the web-based survey platform, coupled with a pre-existing panel of survey respondents, means that the study team can put surveys in the field almost immediately, without each time incurring the financial and time-related costs of recruiting and training a whole new sample, training interviewers, and collecting background information on respondents; this work is completed when the panel is initiated. In the case of community deep-dives, we can recruit an "oversample" of participants from a specific geographic area into the panel and use the web platform to administer specialized questionnaires. DMACS also plans to identify audio-visual materials, such as maps, video clips and other items, to gather information. In all cases, DMACS' design will allow the study team to merge detailed information about the survey respondent's local social, economic, physical and political context.

SRO Project Period 04/2016 - 02/2017
Data Col Period 07/2016 - 03/2017
Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 04/01/2016		***Pretest Start:***	
Pretest End:		***Recruitment Start:***	07/01/2016
Staffing Completed:		***GIT Start:***	
SS Train Start: 10/17/2016		***SS Train End:***	
DC Start: 10/03/2016		***DC End:***	

Other Project Team Members: Joe Matuzak - Project Manager; Dan Zahs - Sampling; Sue Hodge - SSA; Kirsten Alcser - SPA; Paul Schultz - programmer; Brad Goodwin - data manager; J. Smith - Surveytrak programmer.

Other Project Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak; Illume
Data Col Tool	Illume; SAQ
Hardware	Laptop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	Illume
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Check, post ($20 or $10); Cash, prepaid ($2)
Payment Method	Check through STrak RPay System; Check through other system (Export from Illume); Imprest Cash Fund from

---

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (DMACS)	**Project Phase**	Implementing

Risk Level   *Some Concerns*

Monthly Update During February 2017, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan
• Discussed Wave 2 adjusted data collection plan, monthly projections and cost estimates.
• Completed on Wave 2 questionnaire edits and material revisions for IRB submission.
Task 2: Sampling

Task 3: Questionnaire Development
• Drafting of Wave 2 support materials completed.
• Wave 2 PAPI draft begun
• Decision made to skip Spanish for Wave 2

Task 4: CAI Programming
• Wave 2 Illume questionnaire done.
• Final testing of Wave 2 Illume completed.

Task 5: Systems Programming
• Wave 2 preload revised and generated
• Result codes for Wave 2 revised
• Wave 2 SurveyTrak project set up

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training
• Weekly Interviewer meetings conducted

Task 8: Main Data Collection
• Wave 1 web data collection mostly completed
• Respondent Incentive payments processed on a weekly basis.
• Ongoing tracking of missing respondent payment information. Decision made to send interviewers our FTF to try to identify missing respondent names
• Data entry of returned PAPIs completed
• Correction made on counts of Wave 1 surveys: 312 completed web surveys, and 395 PAPI interviews completed by end of month, which puts us at 99% of goal.

Task 9: Post Collection Processing
• Wave 1 QC begun

Task 10: Weighting
Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

Cost information: Kresge Foundation funding

Total survey funding awarded:	$	256,770
Total Expended as of 1/11/2017	$	183,027
Expected cost at complete	$	272,747
Expected Variance:	$	(15,998)

Cost explanation: The cost estimate reflects survey funding awarded to Michigan (SRO) for data collection activities, current expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award.
The cost estimate projects an overrun, principally due to inadvertent under-budgeting of interviewer hours and other

expenses at the proposal stage. SRO and SRC reviewed and approved an estimated overrun up to $17,000. The currently projected overrun is running lower ($15,998), but we will likely have some additional management costs since we are running behind. We will continue to monitor costs carefully and work with the PIs to keep total costs within the awarded funds plus the SRC approved costs.

Special Issues   Areas of Concern:

•   Budget/Expenses – The data collection budget continues to be challenging. Most line items are budgeted at the minimum possible amount. Further changes in schedule or design are likely to negatively impact the projected expenses.

•   This is considered to be a feasibility study. The design of the study is intended to determine if the proposed sampling and contact plan is a feasible way of developing a web survey panel, but there may be unexpected variances. For example, because Wave 1 PAPI response was much higher than expected, the Wave 2 data collection process has been adjusted to try to stimulate more web response. This will have an impact on effort and cost levels. Response rates expectations may be optimistic for the sampling/contact plan and schedule. Because it is a feasibility study, protocol prescriptions (and budgeted costs) may negatively affect the overall (traditional) response rate for the study.

•   The project continues to run behind schedule, but is ready to launch Wave 2. Both the higher amount of PAPI response and errors discovered in the Wave 1 PAPI added to the delay in finalizing the Wave 2 instruments, as we worked through the best options for collecting the missing data from Wave 1 – by adding the Wave 1 questions to the Wave 2 questionnaire. With the delay in launch of Wave 2 data collection, we will likely end up extending data collection at least through the end of April.

•   Budgeted estimates for interviewer travel costs were high and we anticipate that unspent funds for travel may help offset additional management and programming costs associated with extending the timeline.

Cost
Feb 09, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	183,026.88
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	727,746.64
Total Budget:	256,769.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-15,997.64
Reason For Variance:	The cost estimate projects an overrun, due to inadvertent under-budgeting of interviewer hours and other expenses. This overrun has been reviewed by SRC, and will continue to be carefully monitored as the project progresses. The expected overrun was estimated to be $17,000.

Projections
Feb 09, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	Programming and data collection costs were pushed forward.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	712		1.0
Goal at Completion:	712		1.0
Current actual:	638		
Estimate at Complete:	685		
Variance:	-27		

Other Measures

Project Name	Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol (HCAP 2016)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	**Direct Budget:** 3,291,705.00 **InDirect Budget:** 1,185,014.00 **Total Budget:** 4,476,719.00
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (SRC-ISR) Ken Langa (SRC-ISR) Lindsay Ryan (SRC-ISR)
Funding Agency	
IRB	**HUM#:** HUM00099822 **Period Of Approval:** 3/17/2015 - 3/16/201
Project Team	**Project Lead:** Evanthia Leissou **Budget Analyst:** Richard Warren Krause **Production Manager:** Dianne G Casey **Senior Project Advisor:** Mary P Maher **Production Manager:** Donnalee Ann Grey-Farquharson **Production Manager:** Anthony Romanowski
Proposal #:	no data
Description:	This project will involve the completion of a face-to-face CAPI interview, designed to provide a dementia assessment of HRS respondents. A sample of 5000 respondents (one per household) who are 65 years of age or older will be selected for this effort. The questionnaire will be administered to respondents after the HRS 2016 interview has been completed. The sample will not be clustered geographically; it will be selected randomly. It is expected that the field team will carry out well-planned regional trips in order to complete the 3000 in-person interviews. An informant interview will also be completed for each of the respondents interviewed. The respondent questionnaire length is expected to be 60 minutes. The informant questionnaire is expected to be 20 minutes and can be administered by telephone when the interviewer calls to set up an appointment with the respondent for the face-to-face interview.
SRO Project Period	01/2015 - 12/2017
Data Col Period	05/2016 - 02/2017
Security Plan	NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:		**Pretest Start:**
Pretest End:		**Recruitment Start:**
Staffing Completed:		**GIT Start:**
SS Train Start:		**SS Train End:**
DC Start:		**DC End:**

Other Project Team Members:	Applications Programmers: Jeff Smith (STrak), Holly Ackerman (Webtrak, Weblog) CAI Programmer: Jim Hagerman Data Manager: Brad Goodwin Help Desk: Deb Wilson
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Laptop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	Excel
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Camtasia
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, INF
Administration	NA
Payment Type	Check, prepaid ($50); Check, post ($25)
Payment Method	Check through STrak RPay System

- -

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (HCAP 2016) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	*Some Concerns*
Monthly Update	As of February 1, a total of 4147 interviews were completed--2230 Respondents and 1917 Informants. The last sample release was on January 13 with 1686 new cases. The next release it not yet determined. It will be based on which HRS interviews with priority for HCAP get completed. Priority was assigned to HRS cases based on prior wave

performance and once the 2016 interview is complete another check will be done. If criteria are met they will be released to HCAP where they will also be assigned priority. This prioritization of cases is done in order to balance the response rate of subgroups within the HCAP sample since no stratification of sample was done at the start of production.

Given the current plans about the remaining sample, we are reconsidering the interviewer training we were planning. A final decision will be made in February on whether it's necessary to still hold another training. It is estimated that production will go through July 2017.

Special Issues

Cost
Jan 17, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	2,893,335.80
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	4,951,342.02
Total Budget:	4,476,719.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-474,620.02
Reason For Variance:	Several workscope changes have been implemented including additional cognitive tests for the Respondent interview, length of interviewer training, interviewer retention bonus, project management staff hours, and respondent incentives. In addition, actual interviewer rates are higher than the rates used on the budget. All interviewers working on the project are on-staff.

Projections
Jan 17, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Health and Retirement Study (HRS 2016)
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed Total of Modes: 2

Project Type   Sponsored Projects   **Project Status**   Current

Budget   *Direct Budget:*   24,690,534.00   *InDirect Budget:* 8,888,593.00   *Total Budget:* 33,579,127.00

Principal
Investigator/Client
David Weir (SRC)
Mary Beth Ofstedal (SRC)
Ken Langa (SRC)

Funding Agency   NIA

IRB   *HUM#:*   HUM00061128   *Period Of Approval:*   1/15/2015 - 1/14/201

Project Team

Project Lead:	Nicole G Kirgis	
Budget Analyst:	Richard Warren Krause	
Production Manager:	Stephanie Sullivan	
Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher	
Production Manager:	Jennifer C Arrieta	
Production Manager:	Piotr Dworak	

Proposal #:   no data

Description: The Health and Retirement Study (HRS) is a national, longitudinal study conducted every two years since 1992. The study includes a representative sample of US residents aged 50 years and older. Every six years (three waves) a new cohort of US residents aged 50 to 55 are screened in to the study to maintain representativeness. In 2004, the early baby boomers were screened in and completed a baseline interview. In 2010, the mid baby boomer cohort was added as well as a minority oversample of both early and mid-baby boomers. In 2016, the late baby boomer cohort will be added. A series of physical measures and biomarkers are collected with half of all living respondents each wave as well as a self-administered questionnaire. Additionally, permission to link to Social Security Administration records and Veterans Administration (VA) records is requested.

SRO Project Period   04/2015 - 06/2017
Data Col Period   02/2016 - 04/2017
Security Plan   NA
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	04/01/2015	*Pretest Start:*	10/16/2015
Pretest End:	11/07/2015	*Recruitment Start:*	06/01/2015
Staffing Completed:	03/15/2016	*GIT Start:*	02/10/2016
SS Train Start:	02/12/2016	*SS Train End:*	04/24/2016
DC Start:	02/22/2016	*DC End:*	04/29/2017

Other Project
Team Members: Rebecca Gatward (Survey Director), Sharon Parker (Production Management Coordinator), Frost Hubbard (New Cohort), Jennifer Kelley (Respondent Contact Coordinator), Jaime Koopman (Project Manager), Russ Stark (SSL Production Manager), Ian Ogden (Project Assistant), Dan Tomlin (Project Assistant), Lisa deRamos (Project Assistant), Daniah Buageila (Project Assistant)

Other Project
Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys   SurveyTrak; MSMS
Data Col Tool   Blaise 4.8
Hardware   Laptop
DE Software   NA
QC Recording Tool   DRI-CXM
Incentive   Yes, R
   Administration   SRO Group
   Payment Type   Check, prepaid (80.00)
   Payment Method   Check through STrak RPay System

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (HRS 2016)	**Project Phase**	Implementing

Risk Level   *Some Concerns*

Monthly Update   During the month of February, data collection for the new cohort and panel components continued. Panel sample remained the focus to ensure it is completed by early May 2017 with a panel response rate of 85%. Current projections take new cohort production into November 2017. Recruitment of new hires and training planning was in progress in preparation for the April 2017 New Cohort training.

Technical Development: Further development in production systems continues (including WebTrak and WebLog). A revision to the screener data model was made to remove the PSID immigration question for non-eligible respondents due to presidential executive orders targeting immigrants. PSID has been informed of the change.

Health and Retirement Study - 2017/18 technical development update – March 2017
Milestones
• Web pilot (MSMS + Blaise 5) - July 2017
• CAPI mode pilot - July 2017 (SSL and Field interviewers)
• Key decision point - late August/early September 2017 – systems and modes for 2018 (MSMS/B5/B4.8/ST)

Blaise 5 Instrument Development

Current focus
• Programmers are concentrating on the web version. Work on the CAPI questionnaire is on hold until B5 screen templates have been finalized.
• 10 of 23 sections of the HRS questionnaire have been designed, programmed and final CAWI testing is done or in process.
• Work continues to develop the optimum design to collect information about individuals in the survey. This is, currently collected using rosters/tables, in web and TEL/FTF modes. Feasibility testing of these sections is planned for March – May 2017.
Issues, solutions and/or implications
• Compiling the questionnaire takes longer in Blaise 5 than 4.8 – currently with fewer than ½ of the survey sections active, it takes more than 90 minutes to compile a DM (with pages). Compiling without pages causes a 4-10 second delay in presenting each new screen when testing. HRS programmers have created work arounds and the issue was reported to CBS.
• We currently do not have Blaise 5.2 MVC router functions (we had routers in Blaise 4.8 and in Blaise 5.0 (ASP). Of the five routers we have on our waiting list, one (for applying comma masks to amount questions) is critical. If we do not get this router, we will not be able to conduct our Pilot Test.
Dependencies
• Next Blaise 5.2 release, currently scheduled for May 31.
• Receiving Blaise 5.2 bug fixes from CBS (acknowledged, no word yet on next bug fix version)
• Completion of the Blaise 5 templates for interviewer administered modes – currently scheduled for 24 March.

MSMS Development

Current focus
• Production management features, interviewer performance, and offline interviewer workflow refinements.
Issues, solutions and/or implications
• TSG resources with the right skills are spread thin. We have used temporary contractors effectively, but we recently lost our contractor, who moved out of state for family reasons. We are in the process of replacing him. There will be a productivity drop as we train his replacement.
Dependencies
• Blaise 5 offline DEP delivery, currently scheduled for May 31.

Transition to Blaise 5 - HRS systems and processes

Current focus
• B5 offline on laptops – work to develop a system to run Blaise 5 offline on laptops is currently in the planning stage and is part of the SRC Blaise 5 project (led by Gina-Qian Cheung). The process will be determined by end June. Functionality required to implement the process is due to be included in the next major Blaise 5 version (May 31).
Issues, solutions and/or implications
• The HRS (SRO and SRC), MSMS and B5 teams need to work closely to ensure all HRS requirements are considered in the B5 offline solution and to minimise the risk involved in this transition - particularly preload requirements.
Dependencies
• Blaise 5 offline DEP delivery, currently scheduled for May 31.

Overall schedule and other items

• Web pilot is now scheduled for July 2017. The pilot was delayed (from May) because we decided not to go ahead until some key design related functionality is available through 'Routers' (masking and suppressible checks).

• Lead team meetings are scheduled. Initial meetings will focus on development plans, implications of a move to MSMS and Blaise, and subsequent meetings will focus on updates from teams and any topics that require discussion across the full team (rather than smaller working groups).

Special Issues

Cost
Jan 31, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	26,477,073.23
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	35,733,233.56
Total Budget:	33,579,127.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-2,154,106.56
Reason For Variance:	Projections have been refined to add an April New Cohort training and to extend data collection for New Cohort into November 2017.

Projections
Jan 31, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	1,122,095.87
Actual Dollars Used:	1,148,249.68
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-26,153.81
Reason For Variance:	Actual dollars for the month of January came in just over projections due to interviewer hours coming in a bit higher than projected (we had assumed more would be charged to PSID screener).

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	23,569	85%	7.45
Goal at Completion:	23,569	85	7.45
Current actual:	17,497	64%	7.61
Estimate at Complete:	23,569	85	8.0
Variance:			

Other Measures

Goal for New Cohort is 5,228 interviews.
Goal for Panel Iws is 18,341 interviews (85%).

Project Name	Housing & Children (HCDC, H&C)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Status Current

Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 8,774,925.00 ***InDirect Budget:*** 1,968,094.00 ***Total Budget:*** 10,743,019.00

Principal Investigator/Client

Funding Agency

IRB   ***HUM#:***   HUM00114794   ***Period Of Approval:***

Project Team
- ***Project Lead:***   Grant D Benson
- ***Budget Analyst:***   William Lokers
- ***Production Manager:***   Barbara Aghababian-Homburg
- ***Senior Project Advisor:***   Mary P Maher
- ***Production Manager:***   Barbara Lohr Ward
- ***Production Manager:***   Maryam N Buageila

Proposal #:   no data

Description:

Low-income parents face serious constraints when they seek housing, and these constraints may undermine their childrens' development. In many cases, low-income parents will face tradeoffs between dwelling unit quality, neighborhood quality, and school quality. This project has four main aims: (1) to learn how parents negotiate these tradeoffs and make choices about where to live; (2) to assess how features of the child's social contexts--home, neighborhood, and school-- combine to influence key cognitive socio-emotional and health outcomes among parents and their children; (3) to examine how the quality of housing affects parenting practices and outcomes for children and their caregivers; and (4) to enhance the study of child development through theoretical and methodological advances in the study of housing and the other social contexts related to housing.

The project proposes to conduct two waves of data collection, separated by about 12 months, with families in Seattle, Dallas and Cleveland. In-person interviews will be completed with ~ 1686 parents and 2328 children aged 3-10 (at Wave 1). One-half of the sample will be an experimental sample consisting of applicants for a federal housing voucher. This experiment sample will include both voucher winners (treatment group) and voucher losers (control group). The other half of the sample will be generated through a random selection and screening process in census blocks that vary by household income weighted toward lower-income blocks. Each interview with an adult will last about 90 minutes, and will include the collection of anthropometric measures from all sample persons (including children), administration of Woodcock-Johnson tests to children. Adult Voucher sample participants will be asked for three blood pressure measurements, and blood spots will be collected from Voucher sample adults and children. The data collection also includes collecting laser tape measurement of all rooms in a household, 8 block face neighborhood observations, a four-day leave-behind child time diary, and post-interview observations.

SRO Project Period	04/2016 - 02/2020
Data Col Period	05/2017 - 05/2018
Security Plan	NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 04/01/2016	***Pretest Start:*** 10/24/2016
Pretest End: 12/31/2016	***Recruitment Start:*** 06/01/2016
Staffing Completed: 05/02/2017	***GIT Start:*** 04/30/2017
SS Train Start: 05/10/2017	***SS Train End:*** 05/18/2017
DC Start: 05/22/2017	***DC End:*** 05/23/2018

Other Project Team Members:

Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak; SMS
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; SAQ
Hardware	Laptop; Desktop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (laser measurement device)
DE Software	Blaise 4.8 BIA ; External vendor (TBD)
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, INF; Yes, Other (screening households)
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid ($5 for subsample); Cash, post ($75 adult, $50 child); Other (child gift <$5, Finders fee $10, chilc
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office

---

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (HCDC, H&C)	**Project Phase**	Implementing
Risk Level	*Not Rated*		

Monthly Update

During February 2017, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan
% Task Spent to Date
• Held regular meetings with the research team to discuss design, deliverables, schedule, funding.
• Revised and updated project schedule.
• Prepared invoices and invoice documentation. Updated invoice receivables schedule.
• Reviewed/monitored spending compared to budget. Revised monthly projections.
• Prepared draft budget for locating.
• Drafted data use agreement between JHU and UM; sent to Office of Sponsored Research for review.
• Conducted analyses of Pilot data in preparation for main study protocol implementation (elementary school, daycare, Hearts & Flowers, household roster).
• Prepared and delivered recommendations for production lancets, reducing unit non-response for SAQs SAQs, Hearts & Flowers.
• Revised use-cases for testing screening assumptions. Conducted special meeting to discuss use cases in order to elaborate Voucher Applicant sample screening protocol. Finalized Voucher selection principles.
• Prepared materials to elaborate protocol on handling non-standard blocks during Neighborhood observations.
• Held meetings to discuss production reports needs.

Task 2: Sampling
% Task Spent to Date
• - Pilot Production Analysis
• - Pilot Eligibility Analysis & Eligibility Estimation
• - Frame Analysis and Mapping
• - Frame Data Compilation
• - Systems and scope discussions
• - Allocation calculations & discussion
• - Documentation

Task 3: Questionnaire Development
% Task Spent to Date
• Interviewing Systems Maintenance and Development, Preparation for Main Production
o PCG Interview
□ Updated specifications, moving items between SAQs and PCG CAPI interview
□ Revised PRS section, delivered to programmer and PI (inclusion of Voucher sample and Financial R)
□ Revised all SAQs, created draft Financial R SAQ
o Child Interview
□ Updated specifications to include administration of child SSN consent form
□ Updated specifications to include administration of HH and Child SAQ, eligibility question for DBS, and permission to record
o Laser Tape Measurement
□ Updated form and technical specifications, delivered to programmer
o Screening Questionnaire
□ Drafted voucher sample screener, delivered to PI, programmer
□ Revised population sample screener, delivered to PI, programmer
o Neighborhood Observations
□ Updated technical specifications, delivered to programmer
o Sample Management System
□ Updated specifications for Contact Observations, drafted technical for handling hostile field interactions
□ Specified new tabs for locating
□ Updated specifications for mailing/shipping and SAQ tabs to correspond to changes in production protocols

• Conducted further analysis of Pilot data to evaluated per-section interview timing, timing differences between one-child and two-child households, variance in time to complete physical measures and dried blood spots. Made updates to questionnaires to track when these measures are completed.
• Main study preparation
o Finalized Lego/Duplo models
o Issued RFP for printing/kitting
o Revised study FAQs. Began preparation of respondent concern letters.

Task 4: CAI Programming
% Task Spent to Date
• Child
o Began programming updates to Child questionnaire
o Purchased license for Inquisit (Hearts & Flowers)
o Screener
 Began programming Voucher sample screener

Task 5: Systems Programming
• % Task Spent to date
• Evaluated preload data. Made corrections as needed to transfer of data between programs.
• Continued development of SurveyTrak specifications (SRC's sample management system) for main study implementation. Clarified specifications on contact observations, added specification for respondent payment tab
• Continued programming of logging application
• Programmed locating application – sent to testers.

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training
% Task Spent to Date
• Updated site selections for study-specific training.
o Finalized specification for training on laser-tape measurement.
o Specified needs for Train-the-Trainer and Team Leader training.
• Finalized interviewer recruitment plans and timeline. Posted position openings. Issue contract for recruitment.
• Revised/elaborated day-by-day training agenda, incorporating feedback from interviewer debriefing
• Elaborated plans for pre-training study materials for data collection staff

Task 8: Main Data Collection
% Task Spent to Date
• N/A

Task 9: Post Collection Processing
% Task Spent to Date
• N/A

Task 10: Weighting
% Task Spent to Date
• N/A

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables
% Task Spent to Date
• Updated and delivered pilot data files

Special Issues

Areas of Concern:
- The programming timeline between Pilot and Production launch is very short. There is some concern that there will not be sufficient time to translate, program, and test the final production instruments for the May 22 launch. Delays in launching a Spanish module will likely have an impact on first quarter response rates and completion rates, especially in Dallas.
- The frame for the population sample must be determined by March 3 in order to have sufficient time to develop and select the population sample. The Voucher sample will be used to determine the Population sample frame. If the Voucher sample is not received by March 3, there is a risk of a mismatch between the Population sample and the Voucher sample.
- The adult interview is considerably longer than budgeted. We estimate that about 13 minutes must be cut from the interview length to bring it back into line with budgeted estimates, although the Pilot analysis suggests that this did not substantially impact hours per interview (HPI). Therefore, SRC suggested we go into the main study with the instrument at the current length with a plan for cutting during production if needed; the research team indicated that we wanted to avoid any cuts during production.
- The rate of return for the Child Time Diary is very low, despite reminder calling. SRC will work with the research team to develop a strategy to increase the return rate for this component.
- A review of training objectives has made it clear that it will not be possible to cover all instrument areas within the allotted training days; SRC has initiated work on supplemental trainings that could be completed by interviewers post-training, but this will not address the full set of training needs given an expected large cohort of new hires.

Work Scope Changes:
- Questionnaire Development – Budgets assumed that questionnaires would be final at project initiation except for the Household Listing and Household Confirmation protocol. Questionnaires required extensive editing. SRC to review all questionnaires for question wording issues (especially problems created by moving questions to SAQ), create and insert transitions, review and suggest changes to module and/or question ordering.
- Questionnaire Development – Additional (and unanticipated) programming is needed for Hearts and Flowers due to a timing specification change received from research team.
- Work with ICPSR to prepare scope and budget for production of public use datasets.
- At the request of the research team, SRC is developing a locating program and recruiting locating staff due to expectations that a much higher proportion of phone numbers for the Voucher sample will be unusable.
- SRC is preparing for the addition of a Financial SAQ, for approximately 252 households, with an anticipated payment of $25 per respondent. The SAQ is largely composed of open-ended questions, and will require development, programming, logging, data entry and postage.

Cost
Feb 17, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	1,416,010.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	10,743,019.00
Total Budget:	10,743,019.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Feb 17, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	169,402.00
Actual Dollars Used:	152,203.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	16,838.00
Reason For Variance:	A significant amount of travel was budgeted for January, which did not take place.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study (MTTS)
Project Mode	Primary: Mail Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

Budget *Direct Budget:* 656,787.81 *InDirect Budget:* 362,629.19 *Total Budget:* 1,019,417.00

Principal Investigator/Client Heather Hill (Harvard Graduate School of Education)
Patty Maher (ISR PI)

Funding Agency
IRB *HUM#:* HUM90379 *Period Of Approval:* 6/25/2014-6/25/2015

Project Team
Project Lead:	Barbara Lohr Ward
Budget Analyst:	Dean E Stevens
Production Manager:	Russell W Stark
Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager:	Anthony Romanowski
Production Manager:	

Proposal #: no data

Description: For the last 25 years, three major goals have animated the U.S. mathematics education community: the need for more knowledgeable teachers, more challenging curricula for students, and more ambitious instruction in classrooms. And yet despite volumes of policy guidance, on-the-ground effort and research over the past decades, few comprehensive and representative portraits of teacher and teaching quality in U.S. mathematics classrooms exist. Instead, most research into these topics has been conducted with small samples or non-representative samples (e.g., Kane & Staiger, 2012), with the result that it is difficult to
ascertain what, if any, progress has been made toward the three goals. To provide information on such progress, we will collect data on teacher content knowledge, curriculum use, and instruction from a nationally representative sample of U.S. middle school
mathematics teachers. A written survey will build on a similar study conducted in 2005 – 06 (Hill, 2007), allowing for the comparison of teachers' curriculum use and content knowledge – and more specifically, their mathematical knowledge for teaching (MKT) –across time periods. An observational component will record and score videotapes of instruction, allowing for a
description of current instruction as well as a comparison of current instruction to that observed during the TIMSS video study (Heibert et al., 2005). The new video dataset will also serve as a baseline for future studies of instruction, for instance ones comparing current instruction to that in 2025, to assess whether Common Core State Standards have been met.

SRO Project Period 09/2014 - 06/2016
Data Col Period 01/2015 - 12/2015
Security Plan NA
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	10/01/2014	*Pretest Start:*	
Pretest End:		*Recruitment Start:*	01/26/2015
Staffing Completed:		*GIT Start:*	
SS Train Start:		*SS Train End:*	
DC Start:	03/02/2015	*DC End:*	05/31/2016

Other Project Team Members:
Barb Ward - Lead
Russ Stark - Production Lead
Judi Clemens, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson - District IRB
Dan Zahs, Paul Burton - Sampling
Hueichun Peng - Technical Lead, SRIS
Jim Hagerman - Blaise
Shaowei Sun- SRIS
Laura Yoder - Data Mgt

Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS; Project specific system (SRIS)
Data Col Tool	SAQ; Other (video recorded on tablet)
Hardware	Desktop; Tablet; Other (Tablets, Swivls, Tripods provided by research team)
DE Software	Blaise 4.8 BIA
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	NA
Administration	NA
Payment Type	Check, post ($50 for SAQ, $200 video); Cash, prepaid (5)
Payment Method	Check through other system (ISR Business Office); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (ISR Business

---

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (MTTS)	**Project Phase**	Closing
Risk Level	*On Track*		

Monthly Update
During Feb, 2017, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan
•   Revised monthly projections
•   Prepared monthly report.

Task 2: Sampling

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

Task 4: CAI Programming

Task 5: Systems Programming

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

Task 8: Main Data Collection

Task 9: Post Collection Processing
•   Wrote sections of data book and final project documentation

Task 10: Weighting

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables
•   Exported files sample results, district, school and teacher information from SRIS

Task 12: Video Storage Systems (EWB)
•   No activity

Cost information: Harvard subcontract funded by the National Science Foundation

Total survey funding awarded:	$	1,019,417
Total Expended as of 10/31/2016	$	949,021
Expected cost at complete	$	1,019,417
Expected Variance:	$	15,924

Cost explanation:
The cost estimate reflects survey funding awarded to Michigan (SRO) for data collection activities, current expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award. This report does includes a de-obligation of $57,000.. The final estimate includes additional work scope to draw a sample for the MKT, periodically monitor the MKT sample using reports prepared by Harvard, and production of weights and non-response adjustments and assist with production of a methodology report. In addition, the estimate includes additional sampling effort to draw a sample of unselected teachers for a non-response study that will be conducted by Harvard in the Fall of 2016, and develop weights and estimates for that new sample.

Special Notes:

District Recruitment
•   District recruitment ended in mid-December.

- Principal recruitment ended in mid-February.

MQI Teacher Recruitment
- Teacher recruitment ended on March 18, 2016.

Special Issues

Cost
Mar 31, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	949,020.78
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	1,003,493.28
Total Budget:	1,019,417.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	15,923.72
Reason For Variance:	We are projecting a small underrun, based on lower than expected shipping and respondent payments (both due to low response)

Projections
Mar 31, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	17,480.00
Actual Dollars Used:	5,645.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	11,835.00
Reason For Variance:	Work to close the project is going much more slowly than anticipated, due to delays at Harvard in closing their project (and providing data for sample weight calculations)

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot (MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illume Web 2016)
Project Mode	Primary: Web Secondary: Mail Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	**Direct Budget:** 280,748.00 **InDirect Budget:** 154,410.00 **Total Budget:** 435,158.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Megan Patrick (UM-SRC)

Funding Agency	U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, National Institutes of Health		
IRB	**HUM#:** 00081391 **Period Of Approval:** 8/1/2012 - 4/30/2017		
Project Team	**Project Lead:**	Donnalee Ann Grey-Farquharson	
	Budget Analyst:	Christine Evanchek	
	Production Manager:	Lloyd Fate Hemingway	
	Senior Project Advisor:	Gina-Qian Yang Cheung	
	Production Manager:		
	Production Manager:		

Proposal #:   no data

Description:

In each year of this project SRO will maintain the programmed MtF web surveys, including making up to ten changes to each programmed Web survey each year. Once tested by SRO, all programmed Web surveys will be tested by the Principal Investigator and her staff before being released. In years 1 and 2, after testing is complete, SRO will manage the Web survey data collection. In years 3 through 5, after testing is complete, the surveys will be released to the MtF staff for fielding – in years 3 through 5 SRO staff will have no involvement in the implementation of data collection. For all years after the data collections are completed, SRO will assist with the updating of the data dictionaries and other documentation.

Starting during Year 2 data collection, we will do Winter Location and Nonresponse. Calling for the web survey implementation portion of the survey. This is in addition to the normal Panel Winter Location/Nonresponse that SRO routinely handles. SRO will field the pilot survey in 2014 with forms 1, 6, and 2. MTF staff will provide a participant list and SRO will set up the participant list and provide programming production support.

Deliverables include the programmed Web Surveys, Data Dictionary, Test Dataset, Documentation of the Instruments, and Survey datasets

SRO involvement will commence in the Fall of 2012 and will continue through April of 2017.

Monitoring budget against the budget for the first two years 2012 - 2014
_____

Year 3 of the project began August 2015 and the budget has been redone to reflect future effort:

	TOTAL	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	$243,829	$195,210	$48,619
INDIRECT COSTS	$134,105	$107,365	$26,740
GRAND TOTAL	$377,934	$302,575	$75,359

The MPR budget will be updated to reflect total cost of effort moving forward and not total cost over all years..

12/6/2016 We are now entering Year 3 of the project and the budget has been updated to reflect the change in scope.

SRO Project Period	08/2012 - 08/2017
Data Col Period	04/2016 - 08/2016
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	**Pretest Start:**
Pretest End:	**Recruitment Start:**
Staffing Completed:	**GIT Start:**
SS Train Start:	**SS Train End:**
DC Start:	**DC End:**

Other Project Team Members: Gina-Qian Yang Cheung, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Hueichun Peng, Andrew Piskorowski (years 1 & 2), (Aaron Pearson - year 1), Max Malhotra (Years 1, 2) Lloyd Hemingway, Shaowei Sun (year 3 only), Jennie Williams, Peter Sparks, Dave Dybicki

Other Project Names:	MTF Web
Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS; Illume
Data Col Tool	NA
Hardware	NA
DE Software	N/A
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, Other (Managed by SRC Study Staff)
Administration	NA
Payment Type	N/A
Payment Method	N/A

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illu	**Project Phase**	Implementing
Risk Level	*Not Rated*		

Monthly Update

02/2017
Programming and testing continued on Forms - 3 Forms are now programmed and are being tested. SMS programming is in progress and testing has begun - Text messaging will be integrated to work from the SMS. Integrated Systems testing (RLM RIMS, Illume, and SMS) will begin March 8th. Test sample has been received from Study Staff. We are investigating QR codes.

01/2017
Programming and testing of the Forms is still in progress. MTF Web is gearing up for winter location - with reduced sample we do not foresee a great number of hours will be needed - we will train together with Main MTF and share Interviewers for winter location. Charges and costs will be divided between the 2 MTF studies.

The survey Illume survey was closed 11/23/2016 at ~5:00 p.m. Data and paradata will be delivered in December.

Programming has begun for 2017 and the Tech Team Lead is in touch with Arialink and Illume to ensure the software programs have the flexibility to meet the needs of MTF Web.

The increased budget due to the change in scope has been approved. The new scope adds texting as a mode of communication and Winter location activities for 2017.

Below are work scope changes that have contributed to cost variance:

Illume.Next has changed the survey engine for ease of mobile deployment by using Asp.Net single page application, AngularJS and JQuery. With this change, there is expected to be some re-write work with the JavaScript function we developed for MTF on Illume 5.1 platform. Also, as Illume.Next has its own mobile style-sheet for mobile platform, with the fact that MTF will need to create customize mobile display on certain pages and questions like Respondent Contact page, we will need create a mobile style sheet that works with Illume.Next without interfering with the original functions in Illume.Next.

2. MTF is expected to contact Respondents via Text messages as reminder. We will set up modules to send out text vix Arealink. Addition, we plan to set up a technical interface to receive/import the *replying/incoming* text messages from Arealink. SRO has not done anything with this function. We will need work with Arealink and CMT to create the programming module and set this up in a secure manner.

3. Due to data spread across different systems and database (CRIMS, RLM, SMS, Web SMS, Illume). We need more QC reporting and robust reconciliation between the systems to make sure the interface work correctly. This work scope will involve work in Web SMS, SQL DB Procedure (to reconcile as batch) and daily reporting (QC) work (SAS and SQL Server).

Special Issues

Cost
Jan 31, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	332,880.88
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	412,977.44
Total Budget:	435,158.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	22,180.56
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Jan 31, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	25,019.05
Actual Dollars Used:	25,095.90
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-76.85
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	MTF Base Year Tablet Pilot (MTF Tablet Pilot)
Project Mode	Primary: Class SAQ Total of Modes: 1
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	**Direct Budget:** 461,821.00 **InDirect Budget:** 254,002.00 **Total Budget:** 715,823.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Richard Miech (UM-SRC)
Funding Agency	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). Fall 2015-only budget, direct: $67,163.00; Indir:$36,940.00; Total:$104,103.00
IRB	**HUM#:** HUM00112493 **Period Of Approval:** 3/1/2017 - 2/28/2018

Project Team

Project Lead:	Meredith A House
Budget Analyst:	Christine Evanchek
Production Manager:	Barbara Aghababian-Homburg
Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager:	
Production Manager:	

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	The fall 2015 and spring 2016 tablet pilots will test the feasibility of moving from paper Scantron forms to a tablet-based application for the administration of MTF Base Year data collection. Two forms of 8th/10th grade MTF survey and two forms of the 12th grade MTF survey will be administered in two schools in the fall pilot and in eight schools in the spring pilot.
SRO Project Period	06/2015 - 08/2017
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 05/2017
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	02/16/2017	**Pretest Start:**	
Pretest End:		**Recruitment Start:**	
Staffing Completed:		**GIT Start:**	
SS Train Start:	03/30/2017	**SS Train End:**	04/06/2017
DC Start:	04/04/2017	**DC End:**	05/23/2017

Other Project Team Members:	David Bolt (Technical Systems/Help desk), Lawrence Daher (Technical Systems/Help desk), Minako Edgar (Data Manager), Kyle Kwaiser (Technical Systems Lead/Data Manager), Paul Schulz (Survey Programmer), Marsha Skoman (App programmer), Pam Swanson (Survey Programmer), Daric Thorne (SSA). Note: Mike Nugent (SSL) is the field researcher for fall 2015. 2016-2017, MTF field staff will serve as FRs.
Other Project Names:	MTF Fall 2015 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 2016 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 201 Tablet Pilot
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Other (SurveyCTO; custom)
Hardware	Laptop; Tablet
DE Software	Other (Google Form)
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (Schools)
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Check, prepaid ($1,000 (fall 2015 schools only)); Check, post ($500 or $1000 (2016-2017 schools)); Cash, post
Payment Method	Check through other system (Rpay spreadsheet); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (Rpay spreadsh

---

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (MTF Tablet Pilot) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	On Track
Monthly Update	In February: Fall 2016 data deliverables still need to be reviewed by Meredith, after which they will be delivered. We continued work in all of the areas below in preparation for spring admins: • Training - we have decided to train the helpers along with the FRs as we have done to date. Too early to streamline the helper training. We held 2 initial pilot training calls on 2/16 and 2/17. FRs are prepped for contacting and pre-admin visits with their schools. • Survey Wrapper App: Continued development and testing

- Revisit SHApp Encrypt. Preload: Continued development and testing
- Shapp WiFi improvements: Continued development and testing
- Inventory and shipping logistics (Pull from Strak-for scheduling): we will continue with our Access database for spring '17
- Additional Form programming: in full swing, programming and testing
- Hardware: Ordered and applied property and group tags to 1500 new + 320 old tablets; worked with Nancy B to hire 2 full-time temps for end of March for tablet set-up.
- Set up G148 for tablet/hardware storage, set-up, packaging, inventory, etc.
- Ordered new totes, custom foam, accessories bags, crates, etc for our new packaging solution. We have a more robust tote and have reduced the weight by 4 lbs (down to 16 lbs per tote), but with fewer tablets per tote (20 instead of 30). looking for new cart models to try as well.
- IRB continuing review approved

Special Issues

Cost
Feb 28, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	548,943.02
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	945,366.83
Total Budget:	715,823.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-229,543.83
Reason For Variance:	Projections now include SO#14-0047R01S2 (Additional form programming), the spring 2017 pilot work through 4/30/2017, and the purchase of an additional 760 tablets (see below). Budget DOES NOT include the spring 2017 pilot work budget.

Projections
Feb 28, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	44,090.36
Actual Dollars Used:	50,337.52
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-6,247.16
Reason For Variance:	A ~$6,000 non-sal expense projected in a future month hit this month.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG 2010-2020)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 32,653,126.47 ***InDirect Budget:*** 8,448,262.00 ***Total Budget:*** 41,101,388.47
Principal Investigator/Client	Joyce Abma (NCHS) Mick Couper (ISR)
Funding Agency	NCHS, CDC, NICHD
IRB	***HUM#:*** 0002716 ***Period Of Approval:*** 7/17/13 - 7/17/17

Project Team

Project Lead:	Heidi Marie Guyer
Budget Analyst:	Nancy Oeffner
Production Manager:	Theresa Camelo
Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher
Production Manager:	Maureen Joan O'Brien
Production Manager:	Rebecca Loomis

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	The NSFG is a national survey of women and men 15-49 years of age designed to provide national estimates of factors affecting pregnancy and birth rates, including sexual activity, cohabitation, marriage, divorce, contraceptive use, miscarriage and stillbirth, infertility, and use of medical services for family planning and infertility. NSFG 2010-2020 includes eight years of continuous data collection starting in September 2011 and ending in 2019. Every year, new PSUs will be selected to replace last year's non-self representing PSUs and self-representing PSUs, and the project will continue to collect data from a set of major self representing PSUs throughout the entire data collection period. Target number of interviews is approximately 5000 per year.
SRO Project Period	09/2010 - 07/2020
Data Col Period	09/2011 - 06/2019
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	03/01/2011	***Pretest Start:***	
Pretest End:		***Recruitment Start:***	06/01/2011
Staffing Completed:	08/17/2011	***GIT Start:***	09/13/2011
SS Train Start:	09/15/2011	***SS Train End:***	09/19/2011
DC Start:	09/20/2011	***DC End:***	07/01/2019

Other Project Team Members:	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	NA
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (babysitting fee)
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid ($5; $40); Cash, post ($40; $60)
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office

---

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (NSFG 2010-2020) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	*On Track*
Monthly Update	The new interviewers trained in January have been in the field for three weeks. 17 of the 18 NH's are remaining, one has attritted. The Screener Completion Rate has been low. The actual rate for Week 7 was 65.8% while the goal was 79%. Weekly production expectations have been adjusted to more attainable rates for some weeks, although the overall quarter-end goal has not changed. Normally Interviewer focus shifts from Screener to Main interviews in week 6, but this quarter the focus continues to be on Screeners for those who have not met their screener completion rate goal, with an additional expectation of 2-3 main interviews per week. Travelers are being sent out to increase yield in low production areas. We expect updated questionnaire specs to be provided to SRO by March 2017, and have changes implemented and tested by June 2017. Regarding the two experiments that have been submitted to NCHS'

ERB (paper screeners and phase boundary experiment), we have not received word on their status.   All precontact letters now contain language regarding the potential risk of a security breach, as well as all English and Spanish brochures. Follow-up letters have been revised as well and will be submitted to the ERB for review. We are discussing different options for Y7 training, including moving the training up to August instead of September and hiring more staff than usual, making this a larger than usual training. NCHS provided questionnaire changes for all instruments to be implemented at the start of Year 7.

Special Issues

NCHS has additional funding to allocate to the project later this spring. The additional funding is for the current year and will cover the increased HPI, ACA benefits, additional travel expenses as well as year 7 production and training enhancements.

Cost
Feb 10, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	27,985,680.57
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	43,105,306.00
Total Budget:	41,101,388.47
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	2,003,918.00
Reason For Variance:	Increased HPI, yield, travel, recruitment and training

Projections
Feb 10, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	396,097.90
Actual Dollars Used:	379,508.14
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	16,589.76
Reason For Variance:	January training costs were not incurred in February. Respondent payments were lower than expected.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	800	70	9.0
Goal at Completion:	1365	79%	9.0
Current actual:	707	65.8	8.9
Estimate at Complete:	1300	66%	10.2
Variance:	65	13%	1.2

Other Measures

The goals are for the current quarter. The actuals shown above are week 7 of quarter 22.

Project Name	Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior (AHRB)

Project Mode   Primary: Class SAQ   Secondary: Web   Total of Modes: 2

Project Type   Sponsored Projects   **Project Status**   Current

Budget   ***Direct Budget:***   919,405.00   ***InDirect Budget:***   507,595.00   ***Total Budget:***   1,427,000.00

Principal Investigator/Client   Daniel Keating (U-M SRC)

Funding Agency   Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of-National Institutes of Health
IRB   ***HUM#:***   HUM00084650   ***Period Of Approval:***   2/3/2016 - 2/2/2017
Project Team
Project Lead: Peter Rakesh Batra
Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens
Production Manager:
Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager: Meredith A House
Production Manager:

Proposal #:   no data

Description: During early adolescence systems in the brain that are characterized by heightened reactivity to motivational stimuli and rewards mature rapidly, while systems that enable more effective cognitive control and judgment mature more slowly. This "developmental maturity mismatch" has been proposed as a key contributor to health risk behavior among adolescents, which is of critical importance because: (1) risk behaviors are the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in this age group, including diseases arising from unprotected sexual activity and casualties arising from reckless behavior (including driving fatalities and serious injuries); (2) it is the peak age for the onset of a wide range of risk behavior patterns with potential long-term consequences, including substance use and abuse, and delinquency. The "developmental maturity mismatch" hypothesis, however, has not been directly tested in relation to risk behavior at a level sufficient to inform this critical health area. The primary aim of the ANDH study is to understand the behavioral, cognitive, and neural bases of risk taking, through integrated analyses of age differences, developmental trajectories, and individual differences in psychosocial, neurocognitive and neural imaging assessments.

The study will involve data collection from 10th and 12th grade students (~2000 students total) in 7-8 local high schools (approximately 150 students from each age group per school), with group administration in the schools using laptops in a baseline data collection to be completed over a 3-month period in the fall of 2014. Each respondent will attend 2 ~45 minute sessions: one survey and one neurocognitive tests. After the baseline data collection, SRO will modify the survey questionnaire to operate as a web-based survey, and will administer the web survey to all 2,000 respondents in years 2, 3, and 4 of the project (in the fall of 2015, 2016 and 2017). A small number of respondents (150-160) will be sub-selected to undergo neural imaging at U-M facilities in Ann Arbor (SRO will not be directly involved in this portion of the study).

SRO Project Period   04/2014 - 03/2018
Data Col Period   03/2015 - 01/2016
Security Plan   Yes
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:		***Pretest Start:*** 12/21/2016
Pretest End: 01/03/2017		***Recruitment Start:***
Staffing Completed:		***GIT Start:***
SS Train Start:		***SS Train End:***
DC Start: 09/01/2016		***DC End:*** 05/31/2018

Other Project Team Members: Wave 2 Team: Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Kathy LaDronka, Becky Loomis, Dolorence Okullo (data management), Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun
Wave 1 Team: Larry Daher, Emmanuel Ellis, David Bolt, Kyle Goodman, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Becky Loomis, Max Malhotra, Shaowei Sun, Laura Yoder (data management)

Other Project Names:	Adolescent Neurodevelopmental Health (ANDH) (Internal) Adolescent Health Risk Behavior Study (Public)
Sample Mgmt Sys	Illume; Project specific system (SRIS)
Data Col Tool	Illume; SAQ; Other (Inquisit neurocognitive task software; NC helper app)
Hardware	Laptop
DE Software	Other (SRIS)
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (School)
Administration	SRO Group; ISR Group (Dan Keating, PNG Group)
Payment Type	Check, post (Rs, $50 year 1, $20 years 2-4; schools, $1000); Cash, post (Ypsilanti Rs, $50 year 1)
Payment Method	Check through other system (RPay not through STrak (R payments)); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Of

- -

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (AHRB)	**Project Phase**	Implementing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update

February was another busy month for the AHRB project. We were in full swing with W2 production and after an initial flurry of respondent completes, we are currently at around a 21% RR. This is after 1 reminder email.

Moving into production was smooth and all systems were working after many test cycles. We discovered that a Chromebook uses a Linux based operating system and therefore was not compatible with running the Neurocognitive section of our study. We continued to receive completed contact information forms well into the 4th week after they were initially sent out on Jan 24. Therefore we have consulted with the PI's and will begin the W2 R2&3 mailings on March 27 which will allow plenty of time for contact updates from AHRB respondents (and give us time to enter them) prior to the study invitation emails being sent on May 1.

In early February we submitted an IRB amendment that would allow us to use Facebook to contact AHRB respondent that were either non responsive or where we did not have a valid mailing address, email address or phone number. As of this writing, the full committee had only one small comment and we expect this to be approved shortly. We believe this is a major mileston ein the use of social media to regain contact with respondents. To our knowledge, this has not been previously done in a study requiring IRB approval. The team waits patiently for the official go ahead.

Special Issues

Cost
Mar 31, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	1,103,995.95
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	1,509,808.47
Total Budget:	1,427,000.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-82,808.15
Reason For Variance:	Smoothing agreement has been applied. This potential over run includes projections for incentives corresponding to very high estimated W2 and W3 RR (70% and 65%). Once we have more data for RR's from this wave (W2) these will be updated in discussions with the PI's.

Projections
Mar 31, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Optimizing Youth Suicide Risk Screening and Triage In the Emergency Department (YRS)
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone Total of Modes: 1
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Status   Current

Budget	*Direct Budget:*	1,276,181.00	*InDirect Budget:*	703,064.00	*Total Budget:* 1,979,245.00

Principal Investigator/Client   Cheryl King (Professor of Psychiatry, University of Michigan)

Funding Agency

IRB   *HUM#:*   *Period Of Approval:*

Project Team
Project Lead: Esther H Ullman
Budget Analyst: Janelle P Cramer
Production Manager:
Senior Project Advisor: Kirsten Haakan Alcser
Production Manager:
Production Manager:

Proposal #:   no data

Description: This multi-site collaborative project proposes to implement a "universal suicide risk screen" strategy with eligible youths, ages 12-17, who present at one of 14 emergency departments across the country. The research team will conduct initial screening of approximately 9,090 youths randomly chosen in these emergency departments (ED), over a period of two years. Based on the results of the screening, youths will be contacted for follow-up (youths who present with an actual suicide or self-injury concern, youths who present with at least two suicide risk factors, and youths at low/no risk for suicide) by the Survey Research Center's (SRC) interviewing staff in Survey Research Operations (SRO). SRO will receive electronic files with contact information for the selected youths on a flow basis, with the expectation of receiving approximately 4,360 in total. Using computer-assisted interviewing techniques from our centralized telephone facility (Survey Services Lab, or SSL) on the Ann Arbor campus, we will attempt contact with each selected respondent's parent and then the respondent, with the goal of completing brief (10-minute) interviews with ~85% of the respondents 3 months after their ED screening, and ~80% of these same respondents 6 months after their ED screening

SRO Project Period   03/2015 - 12/2017
Data Col Period   07/2015 - 07/2017
Security Plan   NA
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:		*Pretest Start:*	
Pretest End:		*Recruitment Start:*	
Staffing Completed:		*GIT Start:*	
SS Train Start:	09/21/2015	*SS Train End:*	09/24/2015
DC Start:	09/28/2015	*DC End:*	

Other Project Team Members:
Other Project Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS
Data Col Tool	NA
Hardware	Desktop
DE Software	NA
QC Recording Tool	NA
Incentive	Yes, Other (Amazon gift card (Project staff))
Administration	NA
Payment Type	NA
Payment Method	NA

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (YRS)

Project Phase   Implementing

Risk Level   *On Track*

Monthly Update   Interviewing continues to go well finishing up the remaining six month follow-ups. Materials for Study 2 are being drafted for PI and PECARN review (who will then submit to their review groups), the Tech and Management teams are meeting to plan for Study 2. Study 1 is ending with having completed more interviews that originally targeted and

within a lower HPI. The RR rate for 3 month interviews has held steady at .70 and we will continue to think of strategies for Study 2 to see if we can increase this rate.

Special Issues

Cost
Feb 28, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	909,981.05
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	1,969,290.73
Total Budget:	1,979,245.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	9,954.27
Reason For Variance:	Not all details for Study 2 are finalized so leaving some funds unallocated if needed for programming, training, etc.

Projections
Feb 28, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	45,882.26
Actual Dollars Used:	35,708.13
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	10,174.13
Reason For Variance:	As we complete the final 6 month interviews for Study 1 interviewer hours need to be further reduced as sample is reduced, this is the main contributor to the under-run

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	3331	85%	3.0
Goal at Completion:	4200	85%	3.0
Current actual:	3836	69%	1.3
Estimate at Complete:		70%	
Variance:			

Other Measures   There will actually be two surveys in phase 1 (at 3 months and 6 months)...and then a second phase survey.

Project Name	PSID Wellbeing (PSID-WB)
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed Total of Modes: 3
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Status   Current

Budget	**Direct Budget:** 455,760.00	**InDirect Budget:** 250,668.00	**Total Budget:** 706,428.00

Principal Investigator/Client	Vicki Freedman (UM-SRC)
Funding Agency	National Institute on Aging
IRB	**HUM#:** HUM00109415 **Period Of Approval:** 1/21/16 - 1/20/17

Project Team		
	Project Lead:	Rachel Anne LeClere
	Budget Analyst:	William Lokers
	Production Manager:	Derek Dubuque
	Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul
	Production Manager:	
	Production Manager:	

Proposal #:   no data

Description: Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)—Wellbeing and Daily Life Study is part of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics – a national, longitudinal study of families started in 1968. The study is the second Mixed-Mode, Web/Mail study carried out on the PSID Suite. The sample for PSID-Wellbeing and Daily Life Study is comprised of the majority of PSID respondents and spouses and includes approximately 10,784 individuals. Respondents are invited either complete an on-line or on paper. When initially invited to participate, potential respondents were assigned to the Web Group or the Choice Group, based upon analysis done of past data to predict which mode the respondents were most likely to complete. Follow-up efforts have consisted of both hard-copy and e-mailed reminders as well as non-response reminder calling. The interview content includes questions about wellbeing, personality traits, and every day skills and will allow researchers to better understand the wellbeing of America's families and how it is influenced by health, economic status, and family circumstances

SRO Project Period Data Col Period	10/2015 - 09/2016
Security Plan	NA

Milestone Dates		
PreProduction Start:		**Pretest Start:**
Pretest End:		**Recruitment Start:**
Staffing Completed:		**GIT Start:**
SS Train Start:		**SS Train End:**
DC Start:		**DC End:**

Other Project Team Members:	Rachel LeClere - Project Manager Emily Blasczyk--Data Manager and Report Programmer Hueichun Peng--Custom Project SMS Programmer Donnalee Grey-Farquharson--Custom Project SMS Design/Specifications Max Malhotra--Illume Programmer Alexander Hernandez--Illume Programmer Stefanie Skulsky - Project Assistant Tony Romanowski - Materials and Training Developer
Other Project Names:	PSID Web/Mail 2016 FES Wellbeing and Daily Life
Sample Mgmt Sys	Web SMS
Data Col Tool	Illume; SAQ
Hardware	Other (R hardware)
DE Software	Illume
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CXM
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	ISR Group (SRC-PSID)
Payment Type	Check, post ($20); Cash, prepaid ($5)
Payment Method	Check through other system (PSID_RAPS)

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (PSID-WB)

Project Phase   Closing

Risk Level   *Not Rated*

Monthly Update   - No work was needed in February. Work to close down SMS begins in March

Special Issues

Cost
Feb 07, 2017
Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	638,287.39
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	663,128.84
Total Budget:	706,428.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Feb 07, 2017
Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Social Networks and Well Being (SN&WB)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Secondary: Telephone
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	**Direct Budget:** 549,753.00 **InDirect Budget:** 302,365.00 **Total Budget:** 852,118.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Kira Birdett (University of Michigan) Karen Fingerman (University of Texas at Austin)

Funding Agency

IRB	**HUM#:** 2015-02-0123	**Period Of Approval:** 4/15/16-4/15/17	
Project Team	**Project Lead:**	Heidi Marie Guyer	
	Budget Analyst:		
	Production Manager:	Kathleen S Ladronka	
	Senior Project Advisor:	Kirsten Haakan Alcser	
	Production Manager:	Russell W Stark	
	Production Manager:	Esther H Ullman	

Proposal #:   no data

Description: SRO will screen and invite 500 adults over 65 years of age residing in Austin, TX to complete an in-person interview and follow up assessments. The primary aims of this study are to examine the effects of members of one's social network versus others encountered in terms of the quality of the relationship as well as physical, emotional and cognitive functions associated with social interactions among adults older than 65 residing in the Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The screening interview will be conducted in the Survey Services Lab (SSL). The main interview will be conducted in person in the respondent's home by local field staff. The main interview will collect information on demographic characteristics, social networks, and emotional, cognitive and physical functioning including walking speed and grip strength. At the end of the main interview, the interviewer will instruct the respondent on using an Android device (smartphone) programmed with the Electronically Activated Recorder (EAR) and daily surveys (mobile-ecological momentary assessment: mEMA) as well as a microphone for the recordings and a wrist Actigraph. The interviewer will explain the instructions for each of the three monitoring systems: EAR, mEMA and the Actigraph. Participants will use the 3 devices during a 4-day (intensive) data collection period starting on a Thurs, Fri or Sat to encompass 2 weekend days and 2 weekdays. The interviewer will leave the devices and instructions with the respondent and schedule a time to return to pick them up after the 4-day period. The interviewer will also leave a self-administered paper questionnaire with the respondent. The respondent will be instructed to complete the questionnaire on their own and return it to the University of Texas.The interviewer will also be responsible for daily reminder/troubleshooting calls to the respondent.

SRO Project Period	01/2016 - 04/2017
Data Col Period	
Security Plan	NA
Milestone Dates	

PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016		**Pretest Start:**	
Pretest End:		**Recruitment Start:** 06/15/2016	
Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016		**GIT Start:** 08/27/2016	
SS Train Start: 10/17/2016		**SS Train End:** 10/20/2016	
DC Start: 10/22/2016		**DC End:**	

Other Project Team Members:	Karl Dinkelmann, Marsha Skoman, Lisa Quist, Holly Ackerman, Dan Zahs, Paul Burton, Grace Tison, Suzanne Hodge
Other Project Names:	Daily Experiences and Well-Being (DEWS)
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; SAQ; Other (mEMA and EAR app on Android, Actical)
Hardware	Laptop; Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (Android device, Actical device)
DE Software	NA
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Live monitoring
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	NA
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid ($1); Cash, post ($50 + $100)
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (SN&WB)	**Project Phase**	Initiation

Risk Level   *Some Concerns*

Monthly Update   Data collection continues slightly under goals, and the PI is very focused on reaching quota's for males, African American, and Hispanic cases. These cases are "harder" get and require more effort but are the focus of the interviewing team. In the last few weeks of the screening effort only males were screened in to help enrich the sample. Both Field Staff and Helpdesk staff have spent many hours trouble-shooting issues with mEMA surveys (presented to R on their handheld device several times a day) and SRO has been working with the vendor to address these issues

Special Issues   PI is focused on specific quota's that are challenging for this age group and demographic, we will continue to work with PI's and sampling team and production managers to devise best strategies for screening and interviewing

Cost
Feb 28, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	658,067.83
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	849,931.03
Total Budget:	852,118.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-49,020.03
Reason For Variance:	PI has reviewed reasons for overrun and has agreed to cover. She has sent memo to this effect.

Projections
Feb 28, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	79,991.12
Actual Dollars Used:	80,560.44
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-569.32
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	230		10.0
Goal at Completion:	300		8.8
Current actual:	240	.43	10.3
Estimate at Complete:	300		
Variance:			

Other Measures   Goal: Identify 500 eligible respondents via telephone screener, 350 agree to complete interview, 300 complete main interview and all additional components (EAR, mEMA, Actical) for full duration.

Project Name	Stress and Wellbeing in Everyday Life (SWEL)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Secondary: Observation Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Status Current

Budget	***Direct Budget:***	441,062.00	***InDirect Budget:***	242,585.00	***Total Budget:***	683,647.00

Principal Investigator/Client	Kira Birditt (UM ISR Life Course Development) Toni Antonucci (UM ISR Life Course Development)

Funding Agency

IRB	***HUM#:***	TBD	***Period Of Approval:***	TBD
Project Team	***Project Lead:***	Piotr Dworak		
	Budget Analyst:	Janelle P Cramer		
	Production Manager:	Derek Dubuque		
	Senior Project Advisor:	Kirsten Haakan Alcser		
	Production Manager:			
	Production Manager:			

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	SWEL is a study to assess the role of cardiovascular stress in daily lives among matched test and control groups of ethnic minority and white respondents. Data collected via an interviewer-administered 30-min instrument, followed by a 4-day measurement of cardiovascular activity using a wearable biometric device, and 6-per-day self-administered momentary assessments.
	Data collection goal: 300 CAPI interviews (79% RR on sample of ~380), revised to test/control setup in which 150 interviews are needed from 173 test subjects (87% RR) and 150 interviews from the 307 control subjects (48% RR).
	Sample: Participants in Wave 3 of Social Relations (2014) from the Detroit tri-county area.
	Data collection period: estimated for 13 weeks but both the staffing levels and the proposed data collection pace is being discussed with the client given the availability of the wereable devices.
SRO Project Period	12/2016 - 10/2017
Data Col Period	06/2017 - 09/2016
Security Plan	NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	03/01/2017	***Pretest Start:***	09/24/2017
Pretest End:	09/28/2017	***Recruitment Start:***	07/14/2017
Staffing Completed:	09/22/2017	***GIT Start:***	07/10/2017
SS Train Start:	10/02/2017	***SS Train End:***	10/05/2017
DC Start:	10/08/2018	***DC End:***	02/04/2018

Other Project Team Members:	
Other Project Names:	Racial Disparities in Health: The Roles of Stress, Social Relations, and the Cardiovascular System
Sample Mgmt Sys	MSMS
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; Blaise 5
Hardware	Laptop
DE Software	NA
QC Recording Tool	Camtasia
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid (2); Cash, post (30); Other (Cash post biomarker)
Payment Method	Check through other system (MSMS); Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox) (MSMS)

- -

Report Period	Feb, 2017 (SWEL)	**Project Phase**	Implementing
Risk Level	*On Track*		
Monthly Update	Main focus this month is on Pilot cooperation:		

- finishing programming of Blaise 5 online EMA surveys to be deployed on the Preventice phone (phone given to the respondents as part of the BodyGuardian monitoring device)

- we are facing some usability issues with Blaise 5 mobile application not scaling properly to different phones. Our programming is geared toward a Galaxy S3 used by Preventice but we might run into problems if a variety of smart phones need to be used.

The pilot has not yet started, we are still waiting to receive the BodyGuardian pilot devices. Tentative start of main data collection is scheduled for June but if the pilot is delayed further, we may have to revisit.

We are also refining the data collection projections:

- we discussed phased sample launch (approaches to releasing control and test samples)
- we have presented the client with a more realistic 25-week scenario given the number of devices available.
- the client is willing to invest in additional devices and we have to plan the target # of interviews per week to appropriately equip interviewers

Special Issues

We continue to monitor and record any scope changes including a) increased RR expectations b) the number of and the type of wearable devices used in the study (proposal called for one "ring" whereas we are piloting an EKG BodyGuardian device) c) the client is still piloting all wearable devices and final decisions as to which device will be used are still pending.

Cost
Feb 07, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	14,987.44
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	570,337.86
Total Budget:	683,647.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	113,310.14
Reason For Variance:	Piotr needs to make a correction to budget projections, not all of the proposed hours are yet allocated, data collection time needs to be extended based on scope changes. Also, some hours are billed by staff of lower seniority / less expensive.

Projections
Feb 07, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	The budget report for February not yet available.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI	
Current Goal:				
Goal at Completion:	300	87% / 48%	5.8	
Current actual:	0			
Estimate at Complete:			8.2	
Variance:				

Other Measures

Test: 87%RR = 150 / 173 blacks
Control: 48% = 150 / 307 match 1 or 2

Project Name Surveys of Consumer Attitudes (SCA 2017)

Project Mode Primary: Telephone   Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects   **Project Status** Current

Budget *Direct Budget:* 859,872.00   *InDirect Budget:* 0.00   *Total Budget:* 859,872.00

Principal Investigator/Client Dr. Richard T. Curtin (SRC)

Funding Agency Bloomberg, others for Riders.
IRB *HUM#:* exempt   *Period Of Approval:*
Project Team *Project Lead:* Joseph Matthew Matuzak
Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens
Production Manager:
Senior Project Advisor: Mary P Maher
Production Manager:
Production Manager:

Proposal #: no data

Description: The monthly Surveys of Consumers are a series of nationally representative surveys with households in the contiguous United States. The SCA is designed to measure changes in consumer attitudes and expectations.

The objectives of the surveys are to learn what consumers think about economic events under varying circumstances and to determine why they think and behave as they do. Since changes in attitudes and expectations occur in advance of behavior, measures of consumer attitudes and expectations can act as leading indicators of aggregate economic activity. The survey measures are not intended to establish the absolute level of consumer sentiment at any given time. The SCA is intended to measure change. Each month the SSL interviewing staff obtains 600 interviews.

SRO Project Period 12/2016 - 12/2017
Data Col Period 12/2016 - 12/2017
Security Plan NA
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	*Pretest Start:*
Pretest End:	*Recruitment Start:*
Staffing Completed:	*GIT Start:*
SS Train Start:	*SS Train End:*
DC Start:	*DC End:*

Other Project Team Members:
Dave Dybicki
Ann Munster
Kelley Popielarz
Pamela Swanson
Jennie Williams
LaVelvet Harrison
Paul Burton
Nancy Walker
Tim Wright

Other Project Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys SMS
Data Col Tool Blaise 4.8
Hardware Desktop
DE Software Blaise 4.8 BIA
QC Recording Tool DRI-CXM
Incentive Not used
  Administration SRO Group
  Payment Type NA
  Payment Method NA

Report Period Feb, 2017 (SCA 2017)   **Project Phase** Implementing

Risk Level	*On Track*

Monthly Update SCA completed its February study a day early, finishing with 602 completed interviews with the desired split: 401 RDDs and 201 Recons. This was done with an longer instrument of 27.3 minutes in length, using 1801.8 interviewer hours and a 2.99 HPI. SCA worked to further integrate its new interviewers from January, and managed to deliver a solid prelim total of 398 completes.

Special Issues SCA is continuing to hire on an on-going basis, as it needs to scale its interviewing staff up to the point where it doesn't struggle getting the needed hours before prelim. Recruiting and screening is continuing, and two trainings are planned for March. Budget revisions were completed and the PI agreed on the latest version.

Cost
Feb 13, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	54,159.08
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	859,547.85
Total Budget:	859,872.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	324.15
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Feb 13, 2017

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			-1
Goal at Completion:	600	9	2.80
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:	602	8	2.99
Variance:	2	-1	0.19

Other Measures