

Survey Research Operations

Monthly Project Report

Sponsored Projects

October 2016



Sponsored Projects

(ABCD) Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development
(A-STARRS LS) Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study
(CogUSA Saliva) CogUSA Tablet and Saliva Collection
(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 All Stars) PSID Web Explore Core
(PSID-WB) PSID Wellbeing
(SN&WB) Social Networks and Well Being
(SCA 2016) Surveys of Consumer Attitudes
(SCIP-2015) Sustainability Cultural Indicators Program-2015

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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.)</p>												
SRO Project Period	05/2016 - 03/2018												
Data Col Period	05/2016 - 02/2018												
Security Plan	NA												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 05/15/2016</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start: 05/20/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed: 05/20/2016</td> <td>GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start:</td> <td>SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 05/20/2016</td> <td>DC End: 02/28/2018</td> </tr> </table>			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
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	Oct, 2016 (ABCD)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level	On Track
-------------------	----------

Monthly Update	We are doing well! Just got our 17th school (goal is 54). However, we have not been able to move on these few district-level refusals, and they are big, key districts. That, and it does look like the within-school level response is
-----------------------	---

lower than what was projected -- we need closer to 10%, we are getting more like 5%. So, it is likely that we will request a new replicate of schools before the end of the calendar year (or at least consult with Steve H and the team before we had originally planned). Budget is pretty healthy, however, so we are optimistic. Cautiously optimistic.

Special Issues

Cost		
Sep 30, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	34,084.00
	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		
Sep 30, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	13,000.00
	Actual Dollars Used:	13,000.00
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
	Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	54		
Goal at Completion:	54		
Current actual:	17		
Estimate at Complete:	54		
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: Margaret Lee Hudson Production Manager: Andrew L Hupp												
Proposal #:	no data												
Description:	<p>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 from 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.</p>												
SRO Project Period	02/2015 - 11/2019												
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 11/2019												
Security Plan	NA												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 02/01/2015</td> <td>Pretest Start: 10/14/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End: 03/31/2016</td> <td>Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed:</td> <td>GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start:</td> <td>SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 09/12/2016</td> <td>DC End: 09/30/2019</td> </tr> </table>			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
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:	Heather Schroeder, Leah Roberts, Rachel LeClere, Ryan Yoder, Laura Yoder, Andrew Piskowrowski, Lisa Lewandowski-Romps, Lamont Manley, Emily Blaczyk, Genise Pattulo,												
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	Oct, 2016 (A-STARRS LS)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	<p>Activities for October 2016 include:</p> <p>Project Management and Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We began telephone calling on October 5. We are sending production updates to the PIs twice weekly. Work with the ODUSA on safety plan and address lookup activities continue to go smoothly. We were informed that the Survey Research Center revised its policy on sending automated text messages to 		

comply with the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) restrictions. We are allowed to send one text message rather than the 3-4 we had in our protocol, and adjusted our protocol accordingly.

- We worked with Harvard University to update the assumptions used in the current five-phase contact protocol for the first of the larger sample replicates (starting with replicate 4). None of the replicates have completed all the phases, and results from the experiments in Phases 3 and 4 are still very preliminary. We will continue to track and report on results and cost.
- We are scheduled to provide Harvard with a preliminary dataset containing survey data from the first six weeks of data collection by the end of October.
- We submitted and received approval for an IRB modification reporting minor updates to the IVR instrument language and adding the option of making telephone calls to the cases selected for end game (Phase 5).
- We submitted a study description memo containing consent documents for Army STARRS components, to assist AAG with their IRB protocol for the GAT data request.
- We met with the PIs and the Army to discuss the proposed budget for the Special Operations Forces supplement. It was decided not to pursue funding for this supplement at the current time.

Enclave and User Support:

- Members of the Enclave IT team are meeting weekly with AAG to review the outstanding items on the security checklist.
- We submitted a memo outlining the security setup and policies for the UM servers holding personally identifying information (PII), in response to an Army request for a non-governmental Authority To Operate (ATO) memo.
- Background check and Flux user access requests have been processed throughout the month.
- 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. This month a number of R and Python software packages were added to the Flux system.
- We continue to support the analysis teams using the Army STARRS data. This month we provided responses to Harvard's question about the AAS sample weights.
- We are planning for a webinar on the use of the STARRS data available through ICPSR. The PI's will be involved with the presentations.

Data Collection Progress and Plans:

- Production data collection began September 12; telephone interviewing began October 5.
- As of October 27, the production statistics are as follows:
 - o Replicates released: 1-4, with a total of 5,316 sample lines.
 - o Completed Web interviews: 574
 - o Completed CATI interviews: 102
- Starting with Replicate #4, we will subselect a random 50% of the remaining active cases at the end of phase 2 which will be closed out with no further contact. The other half of the sample will be followed up using the current Phase 3-4 contact protocol. At Phase 5 (end game) we will select a random 10% of active cases who will be offered the short interview. This is being done to keep our data collection costs within budget.
- We will evaluate the results from the first replicates as they move through the full contact protocol, and may add telephone calling to increase our end game response rates.
- We will continue to work with Harvard to evaluate the cost and effectiveness of the various experimental conditions in Phases 3-4, and will adjust the design to optimize our protocol. This will likely be done in early 2017.
- We have a small number of cases coded as resistant. As we have found with previous components of the study, if we can make contact, participants are usually willing to do the interview.
- Table 1 below shows response rate by phase. It is still early, but so far we are tracking at or near our response rate goals for the first few sample replicates.

Table 1: Response Rate by Replicate and Phase, as of 27 October 2016

Goals	Totals	Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4		
Replicate Launch Date			12-Sep	26-Sep	10-Oct	24-Oct	
Sample Size		1,006	1,000	1,000	2,313		
Total Interviews		676	349	213	114	0	
Cumulative Response Rate			12.7%	34.7%	21.3%	11.4%	0.0%
Phase 1 (letter, coin)	2%	1.4%	2.9%*	2.6%*	1.7%*	0.0%	
Phase 2 (email, text msg)	12%	12.1%	13.8%*	12.6%*	9.9%		
Phase 3a (\$100, no calls)	15%	8.8%	11.6%*	5.9%			
Phase 3b (\$50, calls)	15%	13.6%	16.2%*	11.0%			
Phase 3c (\$100, calls)	25%	14.6%	23.5%*	5.6%			
Phase 4a (\$100, calls)		15%	10.7%	10.7%			
Phase 4b (\$100, no calls)		15%	5.3%	5.3%			
Phase 4c (\$100, no calls)		0%	1.4%	1.4%			
Phase 5	15%						

*Phase is complete, response rate is final

Notes:

- ☐ Phase response rates are conditional (% completes of cases in that phase)
- ☐ Blank: Phase not started yet

Cost Report:

Our estimate of current costs, and a preliminary cost-to-complete projection by task and project year is shown in Table 2 below. We spent a total of \$173,764 in September 2016 on data collection, interviewer training, production support, project management, and enclave support. We are currently projecting a deficit of \$239,210 for the total project (1.9% of the total budget), decreasing our projected total cost by \$126,924 from last month's report.

In this early stage of data collection, our team is working to improve the efficiency of our processes and will continue to adjust staffing projections each month. We are closely monitoring and reporting on the results of the first few replicates of production. We will use these early results to fine-tune our cost estimates and work with Harvard to make adjustments in the study design to ensure that we stay within budget for the total project. Our cost estimates for Wave 2 (the second interview, to be conducted in Years 4-5 of this project) are still very preliminary. We plan to build on our experience from this first wave of interviewing and work with Harvard to design the second survey and contact protocols next year.

Table 2: STARRS LS Cost Report for August 2016

	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 Costs through Aug 2016	\$718,218	\$119,311	\$319,295	\$336,718	\$1,493,541
Actual Costs for Sept 2016	\$83,590	\$61,456	\$41,187	\$55,303	\$241,537
Projected Costs Oct-Nov 2016	\$111,193	\$418,610	\$86,641	\$114,478	\$730,923
Total Year 2 Projected Cost	\$913,001	\$599,378	\$447,123	\$506,499	\$2,466,001
Variance (\$338,878)	\$1,377,588	\$15,805	\$112,349	\$1,166,864	
Year 3 Budget	\$400,008	\$1,981,395	\$476,249	\$603,408	\$3,461,060
Year 3 Projected Total Cost	\$468,818	\$2,386,257	\$504,874	\$613,814	\$3,973,763
Variance (\$68,810)	(\$404,862)	(\$28,625)	(\$10,406)	(\$512,703)	
Year 4 Budget	\$280,594	\$1,055,329	\$410,278	\$654,463	\$2,400,664
Year 4 Projected Total Cost	\$341,057	\$1,465,270	\$433,682	\$656,101	\$2,896,110
Variance (\$60,463)	(\$409,941)	(\$23,404)	(\$1,638)	(\$495,446)	
Year 5 Budget	\$263,619	\$805,264	\$418,806	\$636,637	\$2,124,326
Year 5 Projected Total Cost	\$324,282	\$1,207,238	\$439,054	\$629,086	\$2,599,661
Variance (\$60,663)	(\$401,974)	(\$20,248)	\$7,551	(\$475,335)	
Total Budget	\$2,088,910	\$5,874,656	\$2,015,689	\$2,758,978	\$12,738,233
Total Projected Cost at Completion	\$2,551,024	\$5,676,931	\$2,120,372	\$2,629,117	\$12,977,444
Total Variance	(\$462,114)	\$197,725	(\$104,683)	\$129,861	(\$239,211)

*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 participation.
 - o We continue to track our estimates of response rates for each phase of the contact protocol. The preliminary response rates are generally in line with our initial assumptions, but it is still very early in the project. We will know more when the first few replicates have run through all of the contact phases.
 - o We are working with Harvard to track early results and will modify the contact protocol as needed to optimize cost and response rate, and to keep the project within budget.
 - o We will continue to work with the Survey Research Center to evaluate and consider other options for text messages that are compliant with TCPA regulations.
- Data transfers
 - o The work with our recorded message and IVR vendor is going well, but we are finding that it is requiring substantial data management resources to move files back and forth multiple times for each replicate. The file transfers between ODUSA and data cleaning of the manual address updates are also fairly labor intensive. We are working to automate these processes as much as possible as we work through the first few replicates.
- Locating respondents.
 - o Approval to receive batch address updates from DEERS has been requested, but is not yet approved. In the meantime, we are submitting sample lists to the ODUSA for manual look-ups prior to the release of each sample replicate. This is a very time consuming process for the ODUSA staff. We received incomplete updates for Replicates 5-7, and will evaluate the possible impact of this on our results for those replicates. The ODUSA has since added another person to their team, and expects to be able to complete lookups on time for the remainder of the sample.
 - o The request for approval for the ODUSA contractors to submit Social Security Number to Accurint for batch locating is still pending with the Army. In the meantime Michigan will continue to submit the sample to Accurint, to get as much contact information as possible without the use of SSN.
 - o We also are asking respondents for their consent to use SSN for locating in the STARRS-LS instrument. We are experiencing a high consent rate in the first weeks of production. This will help us obtain good address updates in future waves of data collection for consenting participants (but it does not help us with locating those who do not participate in STARRS-LS).
- New technical systems.
 - o The new technical systems have been working well in the early weeks of production. Some of the processes require more manual inputs and data manager time than anticipated, and we are working with our developers to identify and implement system upgrades to help improve our efficiency as quickly as possible.
 - o We are also learning that the initial processing of the metadata from the production instruments is going to be more time intensive than anticipated. We will release the initial preliminary dataset to Harvard in late October with minimal post processing. We have added a few weeks into the Enclave loading schedule for the first quarter of survey data, to give the team a little extra time to work with the metadata.
- Background checks.
 - o We continue to experience long wait times for background checks. This impacts new analysts hired for work on STARRS, who must have a background check before they are given Enclave access.
 - o The person who reviews most of the drop box requests is retiring at the end of October. We identified a replacement, whose background check (submitted the end of August) is still pending. Other members of the Michigan enclave team will cover drop box requests until the replacement team member's background check is complete. This will reduce time available for other requests, and we will continue to keep our colleagues informed of delays in service or response time if they occur.
 - o We are working closely with the USUHS security officer who submits the background check requests, and keep project managers informed as we get progress updates.

Cost
Oct 18, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	2,776,988.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	12,977,444.00
Total Budget:	12,738,233.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-239,211.00
Reason For Variance:	The variance is less than 2% of the total budget. 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. It is still early in the project, and we are still negotiating the timing and scope for our production data collection activities.

Projections
Oct 18, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	248,908.00
Actual Dollars Used:	241,536.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	7,372.00
Reason For Variance:	Actual costs were within 3% of projected costs.

Measures

Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i> <i>Goal at Completion:</i> <i>Current actual:</i> <i>Estimate at Complete:</i> <i>Variance:</i>		

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	CogUSA Tablet and Saliva Collection (CogUSA Saliva)												
Project Mode	Primary: Mail	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 2										
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget: 171,995.00	Indirect Budget: 266,593.00	Total Budget: 266,593.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Jack McArdle (USC) Brooke Helppie (UM/SRC)												
Funding Agency	National Institute of Aging (NIA)												
IRB	HUM#: HUM00001406	Period Of Approval:											
Project Team	Project Lead: Zoanne Blackburn Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens Production Manager: Joseph Matthew Matuzak Senior Project Advisor: Kirsten Haakan Alcser Production Manager: Production Manager:												
Proposal #:	no data												
Description:	<p>The purpose of this study is to follow up with approximately 700 respondents from the last data collection wave of CogUSA. SRO will mail an advance letter, a pre-assembled tablet and saliva packets, and a reminder card to all respondents. Additionally, SRO will make an average of 4 follow-up calls to all respondents to schedule a delivery time and UPS pickup time and 3 telephone attempts to non-responders to remind them to return the tablets and saliva kits. SRO will log in returned saliva kits for storage at a local laboratory and return tablets to the PI at the conclusion of the study. We have budgeted for approximately 455 respondents to return their saliva samples and provide responses on the tablets.</p> <p>This budget assumes an overall SRO involvement period of 5 months commencing in November 2015 with the data collection taking place during a 2-month period, beginning January 2016.</p>												
SRO Project Period	11/2015 - 04/2016												
Data Col Period	01/2016 - 04/2016												
Security Plan	NA												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 11/01/2015</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed:</td> <td>GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start:</td> <td>SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 01/25/2016</td> <td>DC End: 08/30/2016</td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: 11/01/2015	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start:	SS Train End:	DC Start: 01/25/2016	DC End: 08/30/2016
PreProduction Start: 11/01/2015	Pretest Start:												
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:												
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:												
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:												
DC Start: 01/25/2016	DC End: 08/30/2016												
Other Project Team Members:	Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun, Dave Dybicki, Minako Edgar, Emily Blasyck, David Bolt												
Other Project Names:													
Sample Mgmt Sys	Project specific system (CMS)												
Data Col Tool	Other (USC program on tablet computer)												
Hardware	Tablet												
DE Software	Other (CMS)												
QC Recording Tool	N/A												
Incentive	Yes, R												
Administration	SRO Group												
Payment Type	Check, post (\$40); Cash, prepaid (\$2)												
Payment Method	Check through STRak RPay System; Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office												

Report Period	Oct, 2016 (CogUSA Saliva)	Project Phase	Closing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	<p>There was no data collection activity over the past month. We are interacting with one respondent in an attempt to get materials returned, and are intermittently attempting to contact the other five people who have not returned tablets. One tablet was defined by the respondent as lost or stolen.</p> <p>Final reports and lessons learned are almost completed. We are preparing to hand over tablets, data, and report</p>		

materials to study staff.

Special Issues

Cost

Oct 13, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 244,240.09
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 248,845.76
Total Budget: 266,593.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 17,747.24

Reason For Variance:

Shipping costs ended up being significantly lower than projected, and the difference on this pretty much matches the expected under-run.

Projections

Oct 13, 2016

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:	400		
Goal at Completion:	400		
Current actual:	432		
Estimate at Complete:	432		
Variance:	32		

Other Measures

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:*** Barbara Lohr Ward
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 - 01/2017
Security Plan NA
Milestone Dates

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

Pretest Start:
Recruitment Start: 07/01/2016
GIT Start:
SS Train End:
DC End:

Other Project Team Members: Barb Ward - Survey Director; Joe Matuzak - Project Manager; Dan Zahs - Sampling; Sue Hodge - SSA; Kirsten Alcser - SPA; Paul Schultz - programmer; Lisa Quist - 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	Oct, 2016 (DMACS)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level	<i>Some Concerns</i>
-------------------	----------------------

Monthly Update	During October 2016, SRO activities included the following:
-----------------------	---

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Adjusted data collection plan, monthly projections and cost estimates.
- Adjusted timeline to reflect delay in training, effects of that delay
- Wave 2 questionnaire and materials submitted to IRB and approved

Task 2: Sampling

- Wave 2 preload variables defined
- Sample loaded into RCLS

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Wave 1 English PAPI instrument completed, reviewed.
- Drafting of Wave 2 support materials completed.
- Wave 1 Spanish PAPI instrument completed, reviewed.

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Wave 1 Spanish instrument programmed and tested.
- Draft version Wave 2 questionnaire completed, ready for testing.

Task 5: Systems Programming

- SurveyTrak projects tested
- Training program completed
- Wave 1 Production project completed.
- Issue with Sample assignment identified, trouble-shooting in process
- Systems for coding out completed interviews, returns, and refusals put in place and tested.

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

- Interviewers trained

Task 8: Main Data Collection

- Wave 1 invitations sent out, web instrument made available
- 800 staff call log created to track PAPI requests, refusals, etc.
- First batch of checks generated, sent through Rpay, received.
- Wave 1 postcard reminder sent out.
- Data collection with good results so far: 231 completed web surveys, ahead of projections. This represents only two completes less than the total amount of web interviews anticipated after PAPIs being sent, which has not yet happened.

Task 9: Post Collection Processing

Task 10: Weighting

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

Cost information: Kresge Foundation funding

Total survey funding awarded:	\$	256,770
Total Expended as of 8/31/2016	\$	58331
Expected cost at complete	\$	275,051
Expected Variance:	\$	(18,282)

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, 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 but programming hours have exceeded the initial estimates, and there will be additional costs there. We will look to make up the difference elsewhere.

Special Issues

- Budget/Expenses – The data collection budget continues to be challenging. Most line items are budgeted at the minimum possible amount. Changes in schedule or design will 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. Response rates may be optimistic for the sampling/contact plan and schedule.
- The project continues to run behind schedule due to late delivery of the questionnaire, and revisions made by the PIs. We pushed back our launch of the data collection effort again to the beginning of October, and Wave 2 has been simplified and pushed up, with a one month rather than two month invitation time for respondents. We have compressed the end of the timeline to keep within the desired project time frame, and still anticipate a mid-January end to data collection. Launching Wave 2 is really our only other area of potential delay, and we don't anticipate this being an issue.

**Cost
Oct 13, 2016**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 58,330.64

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 275,051.01

Total Budget: 256,769.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 18,282.01

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, but we have already used our programming hours, and there will be additional costs there.

**Projections
Oct 13, 2016**

Dollars Projected For Month: 0.00

Actual Dollars Used: 0.00

Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00

Reason For Variance:

Programming, translation, and preparation costs were pushed forward.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	712		1.0
Goal at Completion:	712		1.0
Current actual:	231		
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>													
SRO Project Period	01/2015 - 12/2017													
Data Col Period	05/2016 - 02/2017													
Security Plan	NA													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End:</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start:	SS Train End:	DC Start:	DC End:
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	Oct, 2016 (HCAP 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level	Some Concerns
-------------------	---------------

Monthly Update	As of October 27, we completed 1128 Respondent and 931 Informant interviews.
-----------------------	--

Sample release #5 with 868 Respondent cases was prepared and will be released by November 5. The next sample release will be done in early December. It is estimated at 400 cases.

The second interviewer training was completed October 26. We added 23 interviewers and 1 team leader.

Special Issues

Cost
Oct 01, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 1,583,334.34

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 4,954,703.16

Total Budget: 4,476,719.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -477,981.16

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
Oct 01, 2016

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:	<p>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.</p>													
SRO Project Period	04/2015 - 06/2017													
Data Col Period	02/2016 - 04/2017													
Security Plan	NA													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 04/01/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start: 10/16/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End: 11/07/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 06/01/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 03/15/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 02/10/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 02/12/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 04/24/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 02/22/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End: 04/29/2017</td> </tr> </table>				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
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	Oct, 2016 (HRS 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	<p>During the month of October, data collection for the new cohort component and panel component continued. An interviewer bonus plan was put in place to help increase productivity through the remainder of data collection. There has been a focus on team calls and in weekly updates to assist interviewers in presenting the HRS study to eligible respondents as well as help them address respondent concerns in an effort to secure the new cohort baseline interviews. In addition, approximately 1,100 panel cases have been prioritized as part of a cross-coordination effort</p>		

with HCAP.

Technical Development: During the month of October, the Tech team focused on updating SurveyTrak for the main and screener projects. Further development in production systems continues (including WebTrak and WebLog).

Special Issues

Cost
Sep 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 20,925,069.17
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 34,111,710.68
Total Budget: 33,579,127.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -532,583.68
Reason For Variance: Projection refinements are ongoing for both Panel and New Cohort.

Projections
Sep 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 2,446,074.14
Actual Dollars Used: 2,275,204.51
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 170,869.60
Reason For Variance: Actual dollars for the month of September came in under projections due to non-salary, most of which was pushed forward. These include August training costs that didn't hit and respondent payments that weren't used for the month due to lower than projected production. All other non-salary categories came in very close to projected amounts.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	24,162	88.5%	7.45
Goal at Completion:	24,162	88.5	7.45
Current actual:	13,477	50%	6.7
Estimate at Complete:	24,162	88.5	7.45
Variance:			

Other Measures

Goal for New Cohort is 5,228 interviews.
 Goal for Panel lws is 18,934 interviews.

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:*** 7,449,944.00 ***Indirect Budget:*** 1,684,468.00 ***Total Budget:*** 9,134,412.00

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 End: 12/21/2016

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start: 05/11/2017

DC Start: 05/26/2017

Pretest Start: 10/24/2016

Recruitment Start: 06/01/2016

GIT Start: 05/09/2017

SS Train End: 05/22/2017

DC End: 05/24/2018

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, child)

Payment Method

Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office

Report Period

Oct, 2016 (HCDC, H&C)

Project Phase

Implementing

Risk Level*On Track***Monthly Update**

During October, 2016, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Held regular meetings with the research team to discuss design, deliverables, schedule, funding.
- Revised and updated project schedule.
- Reviewed updates to Master subaward. Worked with UM OSRP and JHU to finalize subaward documents.
- Prepared invoices and invoice documentation.

Task 2: Sampling

- Selected and delivered sample for Pilot

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Finalized Pilot training agenda and training plans. Created training scripts.
- Created training plan and PowerPoint slides for Cognitive Sensitivity training.
- Finalized all project manual chapters and prepared PowerPoint slides for training. Printed materials and assembled training binders.
- Assembled child blood spot kits. Assembled, packed and shipped interviewer bulk supplies.
- Assembled materials and packed interviewer duffle bags for training.
- Child Interview
 - o Developed additional testing scenarios.
 - o Conducted extensive iterative integrated testing. Made updates to instrument and sample management system pre-load and post-load as necessary to resolve integration issues.
 - o Updated specification to improve interviewer instructions (reminders to administer activity card, stickers)
- Post Interview Observations
 - o Conducted iterative integrated testing.
- Adult CAPI Questionnaire
 - o Developed additional testing scenarios.
 - o Conducted extensive iterative integrated testing. Made updates to pre-load and post-load as necessary to resolve integration issues.
 - o Updated specifications to fix typos found during training.
- Screening Questionnaire
 - o Developed additional testing scenarios.
 - o Conducted extensive iterative integrated testing.
 - o Made updates to post-load as necessary to resolve integration issues.
 - o Updated specification to improve interviewer instructions.
- Conducted Pilot Interviewer Training October 13-18, 2016
 - o 10 field staff traveled in October 12 and received materials and laptop computers.
 - o Certification conducted throughout the training period.
 - Production as of 10/30/2016
 - o Screening
 - ☐ 227 households with attempted contact
 - ☐ 16 eligible households identified
 - ☐ 49 ineligible households identified, 17 non-sample addresses
 - o Interviewing
 - ☐ 3 completed PCG interviews, 2 completed Child interviews
 - ☐ 4 appointments

Task 4: CAI Programming

% Task Spent to Date

- Screener
- o Iterative programming/bug fixes/testing
- o Updated pre-load and post-load to resolve integration problems
- Child
- o Conducted iterative testing & programming.
- o Updated pre-load and post-load to resolve integration problems
- o Updated consent presentation to require scrolling before accessing the “Save” button
- PCG
- o Conducted iterative testing & programming.
- o Updated pre-load and post-load to resolve integration problems
- o Updated consent presentation to require scrolling before accessing the “Save” button
- Post Interview Observations
- o Conducted iterative testing & programming.
-

Task 5: Systems Programming

- % Task Spent to date
- Continued elaboration of SurveyTrak specifications (SRC's sample management system). Clarified specifications on contact observations, added specification for respondent payment tab
- Conducted iterative integrated programming/testing on SurveyTrak shell.

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

% Task Spent to Date

- Managed logistics during interviewer training October 12-19 (inclusive of interviewer arrival and departures).

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

- N/A

Special Issues**Areas of Concern:**

- Questionnaire development effort significantly exceeds our original estimates. While the impact to the budget is relatively marginal given the overall size and scope of the project, this does impose tension with respect to staying on track with the project timeline, which has already had to be shifted.
- Corresponding to the increase in questionnaire development tasks and late finalization of specifications, Blaise and SurveyTrak programming is behind schedule. We are increasing staff hours for programming and testing in order to reduce the amount of elapsed time required to test and finalize instruments.
- We are collaborating with other active SRC projects to staff for the pilot data collection, but we are attempting to balance assigning SRC experienced interviewers who may not continue with us, with getting project Team Leaders who will likely support us during main data collection and facilitate a more successful main study. Due to the short pilot data collection period and the gap between Pilot and the main study, it is not practical to use newly hired interviewers.
- Considerably more training videos, which cover the full range of interaction behaviors, will be required for the "Thin Slice" measure of maternal cognitive sensitivity. The Thin Slice developers recommend recording at least 40 to 50 videos covering the full range of behaviors from low to medium to high. Almost all of the codeable videos from 2014 were in the medium to high range of behavior, which does not provide an adequate base of knowledge to train coders. The University of Toronto will not be able to share its existing bank of video-recordings.
- A functional limitation has been discovered in the SRC-programmed Hearts and Flowers executable. If a user enters two keystrokes in response to a single stimulus, the program skips the next stimulus. This cannot be fixed prior to the Pilot.
- Due to the short development period, programs were not able to be thoroughly tested. We are beginning to see some problems in the programs, which are being fixed on a flow basis.

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.

**Cost
Oct 31, 2016**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	433,896.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	9,134,412.00
Total Budget:	9,134,412.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

**Projections
Oct 31, 2016**

Dollars Projected For Month:	182,363.00
Actual Dollars Used:	131,664.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	50,699.00
Reason For Variance: Pilot hosting (training) costs, supplies costs, printing costs were projected for October, but charges have not yet hit the books.	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	75 households		
Goal at Completion:	75 households		
Current actual:	7		
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 Status	Current																				
Budget	Direct Budget:	693,562.00	Indirect Budget:	382,855.00																				
			Total Budget:	1,076,417.00																				
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:	<p>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.</p>																							
SRO Project Period	09/2014 - 06/2016																							
Data Col Period	01/2015 - 12/2015																							
Security Plan	NA																							
Milestone Dates	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start:</td> <td>10/01/2014</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td></td> <td>Recruitment Start:</td> <td>01/26/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed:</td> <td></td> <td>GIT Start:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start:</td> <td></td> <td>SS Train End:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start:</td> <td>03/02/2015</td> <td>DC End:</td> <td>05/31/2016</td> </tr> </table>				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
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	Oct, 2016 (MTTS)	Project Phase	Closing
----------------------	------------------	----------------------	---------

Risk Level	<i>On Track</i>
-------------------	-----------------

Monthly Update	During Oct, 2016, 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

- Delivered scanned parental consent forms.
- Worked on data book and final project documentation

Task 10: Weighting

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

Task 12: Video Storage Systems (EWB)

- Programming/support activities for video storage and management

Cost information: Harvard subcontract funded by the National Science Foundation

Total survey funding awarded:	\$	1,076,417
Total Expended as of 9/30/2016	\$	914,085
Expected cost at complete	\$	1,010,993
Expected Variance:	\$	65,424

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 not include a de-obligation of \$57,000 that is in process. The 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:**Budget**

- SRO has processed a budget de-obligation (not reflected in the numbers above) of \$57,000 total cost.
- As noted above, labor for Sampling staff to draw a sample of unselected teachers for a Fall 2016 data collection,

and to prepare weights and estimates for that sample, has been included in the current cost estimate. The financial projections now extend to December 2017, and will require a no-cost time extension.

- No reduction in estimated costs for the video data storage and technical support is assumed.

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

Oct 31, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	914,085.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,010,993.00
Total Budget:	1,076,417.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	65,424.00
Reason For Variance:	A de-obligation of \$57000 has not yet been processed by Harvard.

Projections

Oct 31, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	17,650.00
Actual Dollars Used:	6,313.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	11,650.00
Reason For Variance:	Sampling work has not yet started. Project management staff were occupied on other projects and not able to complete scheduled work.

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:** 243,829.00 **Indirect Budget:** 134,105.00 **Total Budget:** 377,934.00

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..

SRO Project Period 08/2012 - 08/2017

Data Col Period 04/2016 - 08/2016

Security Plan Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:

Pretest End:

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start:

DC Start:

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start:

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

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, Lloyd Hemingway

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 Oct, 2016 (MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illu **Project Phase** Implementing

Risk Level *Not Rated*

Monthly Update Non-response calling was extended for one full week in September. The Web Survey is still up and running, concurrent with the extension of the paper survey. It will be taken down in early November.

The budget justification for increased budget due to change in scope is completed and has been given to the PIs. It 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 via 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	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	256,800.32
Sep 30, 2016	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	435,761.84
	Total Budget:	377,934.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-57,827.84
	Reason For Variance:	There is a request for an increase in workscope and this has been projected in CRS - budget justification has been drafted to request the extra funds
Projections	Dollars Projected For Month:	37,382.52
Sep 30, 2016	Actual Dollars Used:	37,453.85
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-71.33
	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: 342,799.00	Indirect Budget: 188,540.00	Total Budget: 531,339.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Richard Miech (UM-SRC)				
Funding Agency	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). Fall-only budget, direct: \$67,163.00; Indir:\$36,940.00; Total:\$104,103.00				
IRB	HUM#: N/A	Period Of Approval:	N/A		
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 - 10/2016				
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 06/2016				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 09/14/2016 DC Start: 10/13/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 11/16/2016 DC End: 12/09/2012 </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 09/14/2016 DC Start: 10/13/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 11/16/2016 DC End: 12/09/2012
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 09/14/2016 DC Start: 10/13/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 11/16/2016 DC End: 12/09/2012				
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) Note: Mike Nugent (SSL) is the field researcher for fall 2015. In spring 2016, MTF field staff will serve as FRs.				
Other Project Names:	MTF Fall 2015 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 2016 Tablet Pilot				
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak				
Data Col Tool	Other (SurveyCTO)				
Hardware	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 (spring-fall 2016 schools)); Cash,				
Payment Method	Check through other system (Rpay spreadsheet); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (Rpay spreadsh				

Report Period	Oct, 2016 (MTF Tablet Pilot)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	Oct activities:		
	Administration were held October 13 (MI), Oct 13 (GA) Oct 19, and Oct 26 (OH). Both the Florida and Illinois schools agreed and connected to start making arrangements. FL will be helped 11/17 and IL will take place 12/2.		
	The October admins went well and the FRs and helpers like the launcher applications.		
	We added the work scope from SO#14-0047R01S2 (additional survey form programming) to the projections so the underrun amount went down.		

Special Issues

Cost

Oct 31, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Total Budget:</i>	531,339.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	Underrun has decreased. Projections now include SO#14-0047R01S2. Due to underrun on MTF Tablet, the CRS budget amount will remain the same

Projections

Oct 31, 2016

<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	0

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i> <i>Goal at Completion:</i> <i>Current actual:</i> <i>Estimate at Complete:</i> <i>Variance:</i>			

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:	<p>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.</p>													
SRO Project Period	09/2010 - 07/2020													
Data Col Period	09/2011 - 06/2019													
Security Plan	Yes													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011</td> <td>GIT Start: 09/13/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start: 09/15/2011</td> <td>SS Train End: 09/19/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 09/20/2011</td> <td>DC End: 07/01/2019</td> </tr> </table>				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
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	Oct, 2016 (NSFG 2010-2020)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level	On Track
-------------------	----------

Monthly Update	<p>In the month of October, the first quarter of year 6 was well underway. Several newly hired interviewers dropped from the project during this time (approx 5). Recruitment ads were posted for areas where interviewers were not performing at the desired rate. An attrition training is planned for the month of June. Production started out strong this quarter with a much higher completion rate on both screening and main interviews as compared to the same point in previous quarters. This is due to the two extra weeks in the current quarter as well as the high eligibility rate and higher than usual interview completion rate. The second public use file (PUF2) was released by NCHS covering data collected in years 3 and 4 (2013-2015). Year 7 questionnaire changes are due to NCHS from the various funding agencies in mid-October. This will lead to a discussion on year 7 changes and timeline for implementation. NSFG will also</p>
-----------------------	--

transition to the EDU for collecting signed consent and payment receipts. Additionally, CDC is requiring all studies to include language regarding the potential risk of a security breach in consent forms and study materials beginning in January 2017.

Special Issues

NCHS was notified on August 1st that they will receive full funding for year 6 data collection. As such, the budget will increase by approximately \$1,100,000 which includes a supplement of \$100,000 for methodological research. It is likely that we will have a significant underrun in year 5 due to production costs that are incurred in September, rather than the end of August, given the quarterly cycle as well as the effectiveness of the cost saving measures implemented.

**Cost
Sep 15, 2016**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 26,338,386.00

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 43,327,044.00

Total Budget: 41,101,388.47

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -2,225,656.00

Reason For Variance:

The budget for year 6 will be increased by approximately 1.1 million. Once the funding is received, the budget will be updated in CRS.

**Projections
Sep 15, 2016**

Dollars Projected For Month: 682,946.00

Actual Dollars Used: 564,046.00

Variance (Projected minus Actual): 118,900.00

Reason For Variance:

Interviewer travel and respondent payments were lower than projected given the restrictions put in place to reduce costs for the current year. Additionally, the September training costs were projected for September but did not hit. Supplies were much lower than anticipated as well. Several staff members charged fewer hours than anticipated in September, likely due to other project work.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1250	70%	9.0
Goal at Completion:	1350	75%	9.0
Current actual:	583	35%	9.4
Estimate at Complete:	1300	70%	9.5
Variance:	50	5%	.5

Other Measures

The goals are for the quarter. The actuals shown above are through week 4 of quarter 21.

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: 815,655.00	Indirect Budget: 452,688.00	Total Budget: 1,268,343.00		
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: Meredith A House Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens Production Manager: Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul Production Manager: Peter Rakesh Batra Production Manager:				
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>				
SRO Project Period	04/2014 - 03/2018				
Data Col Period	03/2015 - 01/2016				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018 </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018				
Other Project Team Members:	<p>Wave 2 Team: Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Kathy LaDronka, Becky Loomis, Dolorence Okullo (data management), Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun</p> <p>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)</p>				

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 OI

Report Period	Oct, 2016 (AHRB)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	<i>Some Concerns</i>		
Monthly Update	<p>Oct activities:</p> <p>Our delay from last month continues. In addition to monthly cost reports, the PM provided a spreadsheet with detailed incentive/response rate options/possibilities. Nick P. requested an updated smoothed budget chart - with cost amounts and work scope agreed upon after 6/2016 scope increase memo and budgets were provided (\$30 incentive). SRO provided that document Oct. 5. The requested changes have necessitated reworking of R materials, and procedures for gathering updated contact info. With an IRB amendment needed anyhow, some changes were requested to the content of the demographics section in the survey - and we received the decisions on what items will be removed. As of 10/28, we do not yet have a decision about the incentive.</p> <p>To streamline the gathering/confirmation of contact information from respondents in the survey, we added a rather complex (behind the scenes) respondent and parent/R permanent info process for preload/entry/update to SRIS. The portal, survey, NC tasks, and this contact update in addition to SRIS changes and the emailer functionality are strong technical solutions but requiring a significant amount of testing.</p> <p>Meredith delivered the second (and assumed last) round of Wayne State survey data to the client.</p> <p>Becky started working on training and materials for the SSL 800 line.</p> <p>The changes leading to the delay plus additional technical solutions have required focus from both Peter and Meredith. While we have been working on some management transition, these activities will need to continue into November.</p>		
Special Issues	We are concerned about the launch timeline due to the changes requested and delay. If there is a decision on incentive at the end of October, by our calculations, the earliest we could launch the survey collection is early December. We need to submit IRB, receive approval, print and mail the contact info/consent materials, allow a minimum of 2 weeks for parent opt-out > before we can send the first email invitation to the survey.		
Cost			
Oct 31, 2016	<p>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 0.00</p> <p>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 0.00</p> <p>Total Budget: 1,268,343.00</p> <p>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 0.00</p> <p>Reason For Variance: The projections now include the re-work for two waves of follow-up data collections.</p>		
Projections			
Oct 31, 2016	<p>Dollars Projected For Month: 0.00</p> <p>Actual Dollars Used: 0.00</p> <p>Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00</p> <p>Reason For Variance:</p>		

Measures	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<p>Current Goal:</p> <p>Goal at Completion:</p> <p>Current actual:</p> <p>Estimate at Complete:</p> <p>Variance:</p>			

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:*** 917,405.00 ***Indirect Budget:*** 505,822.00 ***Total Budget:*** 1,423,227.00

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

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

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 NA

Administration NA

Payment Type NA

Payment Method NA

Report Period Oct, 2016 (YRS) **Project Phase** Implementing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update Interviewing continues to go well with three month and six month follow-ups. We have received the increased funding for Study 2 (supplement).

We are continuing to discuss with the PI which "parent only" interviews should be counted as partial interviews and other concerns there may be about coding cases missing the "youth" interview that do provide information about the youth (institutionalized, etc.) -

Special Issues

Cost		
Oct 31, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	757,067.24
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,339,357.68
	Total Budget:	1,423,227.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	5,494.32
	Reason For Variance:	

Projections		
Oct 31, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	49,751.14
	Actual Dollars Used:	64,092.43
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-14,341.29
	Reason For Variance:	Highest month of interviewing costs due to last month of additional sample and three payperiod month. Adjustments for future months keep budget on-target.

Measures		Units Complete	RR	HPI
	Current Goal:	2703	85%	3.0
	Goal at Completion:	4200	85%	3.0
	Current actual:	3376	69%	1.2
	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 Web Explore Core (PSID All Stars)					
Project Mode	Primary: Web Total of Modes: 1					
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget:	194,766.00	Indirect Budget:	108,096.00 Total Budget: 302,862.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Vicki Freedman (SRC-PSID) Kate McGonagle (SRC-PSID)					
Funding Agency						
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00101072	Period Of Approval:	Non-regulated		
Project Team	Project Lead:	Meredith A House				
	Budget Analyst:	Janelle P Cramer				
	Production Manager:					
	Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul				
	Production Manager:					
	Production Manager:					
Proposal #:	no data					
Description:	Phase 2 of converting the PSID core instrument to web. Phase 2 will use Blaise 5 and MSMS.					
SRO Project Period	09/2014 - 08/2016					
Data Col Period	06/2016 - 08/2016					
Security Plan	NA					
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 07/05/2016 </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 10/19/2016 </td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 07/05/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 10/19/2016
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 07/05/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 10/19/2016					
Other Project Team Members:	Jennie Williams = Data management; Youhong Liu/Peter Sparks = Blaise programming, Pam Swanson = MSMS set up; Jeff Smith = TSG oversight; Max Malhotra = Portal programming; Jim Rodgers and Gina Cheung = MSMS/integration leadership					
Other Project Names:	PSID Webinizing Phase 2 PSID Conversion to Web					
Sample Mgmt Sys	MSMS					
Data Col Tool	Blaise 5					
Hardware	Other (R Hardware)					
DE Software	N/A					
QC Recording Tool	N/A					
Incentive	Yes, R					
Administration	SRO Group; ISR Group (PSID)					
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (100); Other (\$10 Amazon gift card)					
Payment Method	Check through other system (PSID RAPS); Other (Amazon gift cards)					

Report Period	Oct, 2016 (PSID All Stars)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level	On Track
-------------------	----------

Monthly Update	Oct activities:
-----------------------	-----------------

We continued R support as needed and progress monitoring. The PIs decided to close the survey for both replicates on 10/19/16. They determined the 3 partial surveys should be sent to state 1005, accepted partial. Final stats are as follows:

TotalSample	200
Completed Total	96
Completed Partial	3
Total Final Non-lw	40
Final Refusal	0

NS 61
 Response Rate 69.1%
 Completion Rate 97.8%

Final survey, MSMS and paradata files, including the three partials were delivered on Oct. 26. Loose ends include - 1) whether or not PSID wants Jennie to merge back onto the data files certain preload variables that were not needed in systems or for reports (PSID or SRO to merge back?) and 2) status of authentication paradata deliverable - if we are delivering, what does this look like?

Budget: On Oct. 6, the PI sent an email confirming the project will cover the projected overrun of ~\$154,000.

Special Issues

Cost
Oct 31, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Total Budget:</i>	302,862.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections
Oct 31, 2016

<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i> <i>Goal at Completion:</i> <i>Current actual:</i> <i>Estimate at Complete:</i> <i>Variance:</i>			

Other Measures

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:	<p>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</p>				
SRO Project Period	10/2015 - 09/2016				
Data Col Period	NA				
Security Plan	NA				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 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	Oct, 2016 (PSID-WB)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level *On Track*

Monthly Update -Continued passive data collection. We continue to enter PAPIs and check web survey completes.

Special Issues

Cost
Oct 31, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Total Budget:</i>	706,428.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections
Oct 31, 2016

<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i> <i>Goal at Completion:</i> <i>Current actual:</i> <i>Estimate at Complete:</i> <i>Variance:</i>			

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:	516,716.00	Indirect Budget:	284,195.00 Total Budget: 800,911.00										
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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>													
SRO Project Period	01/2016 - 04/2017													
Data Col Period														
Security Plan	NA													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 08/27/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 10/17/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 10/20/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 10/22/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End:</td> </tr> </table>				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:
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	Oct, 2016 (SN&WB)	Project Phase	Initiation																								
Risk Level	Some Concerns																										
Monthly Update	Training was held in October, both GIT and Study Specific and 10 interviewers were trained. One is also the TL for the project. The training was complex and mEMA continued to have changes even during the week of training but the interviewers seemed "tech-savvy" and interested in the various systems and devices. We will work closely over the first part of November to assess where technical processes may need to be changed. We plan to "de-brief" with the PI early November and review the first two weeks of Production as a type of "pilot"																										
Special Issues	The Technical team has been charged with development of many new systems to integrate actual set up, mEMA and EAR in addition to a relatively complex Main Blaise application. Good progress has been made however vendors still need to provide more developed applications for us to be able to fully test																										
Cost																											
Oct 31, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	212,461.13																									
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	812,841.76																									
	Total Budget:	800,911.00																									
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-11,930.76																									
	Reason For Variance:	Unsure actual HPI for production, will adjust as data collection is underway																									
Projections																											
Oct 31, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	126,302.76																									
	Actual Dollars Used:	73,235.80																									
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	53,066.96																									
	Reason For Variance:	Now that training is completed, and data collection is starting we will adjust projections for production based on actual field experience																									
Measures	<table><tr><th></th><th>Units Complete</th><th>RR</th><th>HPI</th></tr><tr><td>Current Goal:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Goal at Completion:</td><td>300</td><td></td><td>8.8</td></tr><tr><td>Current actual:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Estimate at Complete:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Variance:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>				Units Complete	RR	HPI	Current Goal:				Goal at Completion:	300		8.8	Current actual:				Estimate at Complete:				Variance:			
	Units Complete	RR	HPI																								
Current Goal:																											
Goal at Completion:	300		8.8																								
Current actual:																											
Estimate at Complete:																											
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	Surveys of Consumer Attitudes (SCA 2016)				
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone Total of Modes: 1				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 697,302.00	Indirect Budget: 0.00	Total Budget: 697,302.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Dr. Richard T. Curtin (SRC)				
Funding Agency	Bloomberg, others for Riders.				
IRB	HUM#:	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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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 500 interviews.</p>				
SRO Project Period	01/2016 - 12/2016				
Data Col Period	01/2016 - 12/2016				
Security Plan	NA				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:				
Other Project Team Members:	Dave Dybicki Ann Munster Kelley Popielarz Pamela Swanson Jennie Williams LaVelvet Harrison				
Other Project Names:					
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	Oct, 2016 (SCA 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing		
Risk Level	Some Concerns				
Monthly Update	SCA completed its October study a day early, with a higher than targeted total and the desired split between RDD and Recon completes. In all, 575 interviews were completed, 382 RDDs and 193 Recons. This was done with an				

instrument of 35.0 minutes, using 1694 interviewer hours and a 2.95 HPI. This was the second longest instrument SCA has had since moving to sell phones.

SCA also hired and trained three additional interviewers this month, two of whom were new hires, and one of whom did not become certified. It continued to integrate interviewers added in September.

Special Issues

Getting interview coding done in time for prelim has been a concern, and another SSA is being trained on coding the assist with this.

Cost

Oct 13, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	608,204.20
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	789,357.03
Total Budget:	697,302.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-92,055.03
Reason For Variance:	Scope has continued to change, as budget was based on 500 completes per month, and has been expanding, since March, toward 600. This has meant more interviewer hours and more hiring activity.

Projections

Oct 13, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	59,384.00
Actual Dollars Used:	322.88
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	262.57
Reason For Variance:	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:	570	9	2.80
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:	575	8	2.95
Variance:	5	-1	0.15

Other Measures

Project Name Sustainability Cultural Indicators Program-2015 (SCIP-2015)

Project Mode Primary: Web Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

Budget **Direct Budget:** 69,535.00 **Indirect Budget:** 0.00 **Total Budget:** 69,535.00

Principal Investigator/Client John Callewart (Graham Environmental Sustainability Institute)
Robert Marans (UM-Survey Research Center)

Funding Agency

IRB **HUM#:** 00068573 **Period Of Approval:** 6/5/2015-6/4/2016

Project Team **Project Lead:** Andrew L Hupp
Budget Analyst: Sherri Cranson
Production Manager:
Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager:
Production Manager:

Proposal #: no data

Description: The goal of the overall Sustainability Cultural Indicators Project (SCIP), a joint project of the Institute for Social Research (ISR) and the Graham Environmental Sustainability Institute (Graham), is to measure changes in sustainability-related knowledge, commitments, and practices in the University of Michigan (U-M) community over time. The principle component of SCIP is a large-scale annual survey, to be conducted with U-M students, faculty, and staff from 2012 to 2018.

SRO Project Period 07/2015 - 06/2016

Data Col Period 10/2015 - 11/2015

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: 10/21/2015	DC End:

Other Project Team Members: Andrew Hupp - instrument revisions/project management/methodological experimental design
Mick Couper/James Wagner- methodological experimental design
Sherri Cranson - financial support and analysis
Hueichun Peng - e-mail tracking programming
Minako Edgar - sample prep, dataset creation, GIS analysis
Dan Zahs - weighting and sampling support
Paul Burton - analysis
Will Chan - analysis (PSM graduate students working on PI side)

Other Project Names: Campus Sustainability

Sample Mgmt Sys Illume

Data Col Tool Illume

Hardware NA

DE Software N/A

QC Recording Tool N/A

Incentive Yes, Other (A portion of R's (a raffle))

Administration SRO Group

Payment Type Other (Amazon gift code)

Payment Method Other (Amazon gift code sent via e-mail)

Report Period Oct, 2016 (SCIP-2015) **Project Phase** Closing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update October '16
-No work was done in October. Waiting for the final October cost report so SCIP-2015 can be closed out of MPR.
September '16

-In September, Minako finished up work with Bob on GIS analysis. Andrew H. (Andrew H., Heather, and Andrew P.; two chapters) and Minako (Minako and Bob) both worked and submitted drafts of their chapters related to SCIP data collection for an edited volume on Sustainability being published in 2017.

To Do:

1. Finish the methods report for posting to the Graham website.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.

August '16

-In August, Minako worked with Bob on some GIS analysis and worked with the team on the datasets and rerunning one of the indices that didn't look quite right.

To Do:

1. Finish the methods report for posting to the Graham website.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.

July '16

-An SDG meeting was held to discuss the issues around skipping a year and what the design should be moving forward.

-Andrew H., Heather, and Andrew P. worked on their chapters for the book for next year's international sustainability conference to be held at ISR in May. The first chapter drafts are due in September.

-Andrew H. worked on the methods report basing it on the items to report from the AAPOR transparency initiative.

-Some of the under run has been allocated to Minako (40 hours per month July/Aug/Sept) to help with PI requests. We will use the same account and Andrew H. will monitor.

-Dan delivered the panel weights at the end of June. The team is working on the analysis of panel data now that they have the weights.

To Do:

1. Finish the methods report for posting to the Graham website.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.

June '16

-Andrew H., Minako and Dan met with the PIs to discuss the design going forward (no data collection is planned for Fall 2016. A series of items were discussed. An SDG meeting has been scheduled for July to discuss the issues around skipping a year and what the design should be moving forward.

-Andrew H., Heather, and Andrew P. submitted two methodological abstracts (based on AAPOR and IFDTC presentations) that were accepted for an international sustainability conference to be held at ISR next May. They were accepted. The papers will be chapters in a book to come out just after the conference. The first chapter drafts are due in September.

-Minako submitted a poster (with Bob) related to the work they have been doing with GIS and travel.

-Andrew H. worked on the methods report basing it on the items to report from the AAPOR transparency initiative.

-There is some undone analysis work on the PI side to prepare the report for the university. This wave of SCIP currently has ~\$13,000 under run. Some of that under run has been allocated to some time for Minako (40 hours per month July/Aug/Sept) for the rest of the summer to help with PI requests. We will use the same account and Andrew H. will monitor.

-Dan is to deliver the panel weights by the end of the month.

To Do:

1. Finish the methods report for posting to the Graham website.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Panel sample weights (Dan Z.)

May '16

Work in May included:

-Andrew H., Minako and Dan met with the PIs to discuss the design going forward (no data collection is planned for Fall 2016. A series of items were discussed. An SDG meeting has been scheduled for July to discuss the issues around skipping a year and what the design should be moving forward.

-Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) conducted the first set of methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys and presented finding at AAPOR and IFDTC.

-Andrew H. worked on the methods report basing it on the items to report from the AAPOR transparency initiative.

-Andrew H. and Minako were asked to submit abstracts for an international sustainability conference to be held at ISR

next May. Andrew H., Heather and Andrew P., worked on a set of methodological abstracts.

To Do:

1. Finish the methods report for posting to the Graham website in June.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Panel sample weights (Dan Z.)

April '16

Work in April included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (AAPOR and IFDTC abstracts were accepted).
- Andrew H. worked on the methods report basing it on the items to report from the AAPOR transparency initiative.
- Minako discovered an issue with a new question programmed in the 2015 survey. It was similar to a question in prior years. The similar question also remained in the survey. During programming the new question was programmed using the original variable names and the previous question was assigned new variable names by mistake. The variables were renamed in the 2015 dataset to be consistent with prior years.
- Andrew revised the questionnaires to fix the above variable naming issue and provided to the PI to post on the Graham website.

To Do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report, adding in the 2015 data. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Panel sample weights (Dan Z.)

March '16

Work in March included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (AAPOR and IFDTC abstracts were accepted).
- Andrew H. worked on the methods report basing it on the items to report from the AAPOR transparency initiative.
- Minako discovered an issue with a new question programmed in the 2015 survey. It was similar to a question in prior years. The similar question also remained in the survey. During programming the new question was programmed using the original variable names and the previous question was assigned new variable names by mistake. The variables were renamed in the 2015 dataset to be consistent with prior years.

To Do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report, adding in the 2015 data. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Panel sample weights (Dan Z.)

February '16

Work in February included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (AAPOR and IFDTC abstracts were accepted).
- Dan provided weights for the cross-section cases.
- Andrew H. notified winners
- Andrew H. reconciled the imprest cash account.
- Andrew H. created a crosswalk of questions asked each year (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015) by instrument (Faculty/Staff cross-section, Student cross-section, Student panel)

To Do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report, adding in the 2015 data. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).

3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Panel sample weights (Dan Z.)

January '16

Work in January included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew, and Will (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (an AAPOR abstract was accepted, and a IFDTC abstract was submitted).
- An imprest request was made and picked up. The money was used to purchase Visa gift cards at the UM Credit Union. Those cards were in turn, used to purchase gift codes from Amazon.
- Minako created the file of cases (those who said "yes" to be willing to have the token and either submitted their survey (DATSTATPCTCOMPLETE=100 or those cases that were taken as partials (DATSTATPCTUNANSWERED <=20).
- Numbers were randomly generated to select gift code winners.

To do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report, adding in the 2015 data. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Sample weights (Dan Z.)
5. Notify raffle winners.
6. Reconcile imprest cash account.

December '15

Work in December included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew, and Will (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 survey.
- Data collection concluded December 7th. Data collection was extended for three groups who have not yet met their targets (freshman, juniors, and the panel (about 200 interviews short)). All other groups (faculty, staff, sophomores, seniors and grad students) have met their goal. RRs across the board are down from the prior year (faculty/staff ~2%, fr ~7%, so ~4%, jr ~5%, sr ~3%, grad ~8%, panel ~10%).
- An imprest cash account was set-up.
- Numbers were randomly generated to select gift code winners.

To do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report, adding in the 2015 data. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Sample weights (Dan Z.)
5. Purchase gift codes.
6. Notify raffle winners.
7. Reconcile imprest cash account.

November '15

Work in November included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew, and Will (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 survey.
- Andrew updated the preload file and Reminder 3 email job (with help from Hueichun) to accommodate the video reminder for a random half of the sample.
- Andrew created and shared an updated data collection timeline/plan.
- A meeting was held with the visitor from Turkey and the researcher from SNRE.
- The President help a sustainability town hall meeting at Hatcher Graduate Library. SCIP was one of the topics.
- Data collection continued through the month of November. Data collection was extended for three groups who have not yet met their targets (freshman, juniors, and the panel (about 200 interviews short)). All other groups (faculty, staff, sophomores, seniors and grad students) have met their goal. RRs across the board are down from the prior year (faculty/staff ~2%, fr ~7%, so ~4%, jr ~5%, sr ~3%, grad ~8%, panel ~10%).
- An AAPOR abstract was written and submitted regarding experiments carried out on SCIP.
- An IFDTC abstract using SCIP data has been submitted to SRO.

To do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report, adding in the 2015 data. This includes rewriting the previous years

into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.

2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Sample weights (Dan Z.)

October '15

Work in October included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly. This month the meeting focused on the upcoming plan for this fall's data collection and a visit from a scholar in November.
- Andrew, Paul B., and Will (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 survey.
- Andrew created (and John submitted) a second IRB amendment for fall data collection (minor questionnaire revisions).
- Andrew programmed and tested (along with the PIs) the updated datamodels.
- Minako created the preload files.
- Andrew uploaded the preload files and published the surveys.
- Andrew created and shared data collection timeline/plan.
- A researcher from SNRE is interested in the survey results for a class. She has signed an ISR Pledge of Confidentiality (Andrew has). She will join the team at the meeting with the visitor from Turkey to become more familiar with the project.
- Data collection began on 10/26.

To do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Prepare for meeting with visitor from Turkey.

September '15

Work in September included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly. This month the meeting focused on the upcoming plan for this fall's data collection and a visit from a scholar in November.
- Andrew and Paul B. are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 survey, Will (an PSM student) has time and will be assisting in October.
- Andrew created (and John submitted) the IRB amendment for fall data collection.
- We received the video from the U-M's head women's basketball coach to be used in one of the reminders.

To do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. IRB amendment for questionnaire revision
5. Programming changes and testing of 2015 survey
6. Create data collection schedule

Aug. '15

Work in August included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly. This month the meeting focused on revisions to the questionnaire for the Fall 2015 survey and about the 2014 report to the university.
- Minako continues to do analysis for Bob.
- Andrew and Paul B. are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 survey.
- Andrew provided a methodological summary for the report to the university.

To do:

1. Continue writing the full 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
2. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. IRB amendment for the Fall 2015 survey
5. Video of women's basketball coach
6. Programming changes and testing of 2015 survey

July '15

Work in July included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly. This month the meeting focused on revisions to the questionnaire for the Fall 2015 survey.
- Minako continues to do some analysis for Bob.
- Andrew and Paul B. are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 survey.

To do:

1. Produce final datasets once all weights have been created and values recoded.
2. Continue writing 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
3. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
4. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
5. IRB amendment for the Fall 2015 survey

Special Issues

Cost

Oct 31, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	58,113.40	
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	59,977.11	
Total Budget:	69,535.00	
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	9,557.89	
Reason For Variance:	Unused data manager hours accounted for the underrun in April. There is an open discussion with the PI about using the unused funds for some analysis in the next fiscal year.	

Projections

Oct 31, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	1,863.71	
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00	
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00	
Reason For Variance:	<p>July '16 - We've allocated 120 hours (\$14,938) of the under run (40 hours a month for August, September, and October) for Minako to do some work with Bob and John. Andrew H. will continue to monitor the costs those months.</p> <p>June '16 - End FY16 with an under run. Minako is still doing work for the PIs (40/mo projected for July-Sept). We are not conducting a survey. Data collection will resume in the Fall of 2017.</p> <p>April '16 - Unused projections moved forward.</p> <p>March '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.</p> <p>February '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.</p> <p>January '16 - The reason for the large difference, is the incentives were projected in January. Those projections are being moved forward.</p> <p>December '15 - Unused data analyst hours. This will be needed and moved forward.</p> <p>November '15 - Unused data analyst hours. This will be needed and moved forward.</p> <p>October '15- Unused project manager hours and data analyst hours due to other projects. Unused moved forward.</p> <p>August '15 - Unused project manager hours and data analyst hours due to other projects and vacations. Unused moved forward.</p> <p>July '15 - Unused project manager hours due to other projects. Moved forward.</p>	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	6,386	30%	NA
Goal at Completion:			NA
Current actual:	5,430	26%	NA
Estimate at Complete:			NA
Variance:			NA

Other Measures