

# ***Survey Research Operations***

## ***Monthly Project Report***

### ***Sponsored Projects***

***November 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:** ABCD is a longitudinal study of about 10,000 children from ages 9-10 through early adulthood to assess factors that influence individual brain development trajectories and functional outcomes. UM Dept of Psychiatry is one of 19 research sites across the country.

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

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

**SRO Project Period** 05/2016 - 03/2018

**Data Col Period** 05/2016 - 02/2018

**Security Plan** NA

**Milestone Dates**

***PreProduction Start:*** 05/15/2016

***Pretest Start:***

***Pretest End:***

***Recruitment Start:*** 05/20/2016

***Staffing Completed:*** 05/20/2016

***GIT Start:***

***SS Train Start:***

***SS Train End:***

***DC Start:*** 05/20/2016

***DC End:*** 02/28/2018

**Other Project**

**Team Members:**

**Other Project Names:** Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development

**Sample Mgmt Sys** NA

**Data Col Tool** NA

**Hardware** NA

**DE Software** NA

**QC Recording Tool** NA

**Incentive** NA

**Administration** NA

**Payment Type** NA

**Payment Method** NA

**Report Period** Nov, 2016 (ABCD)

**Project Phase** Implementing

**Risk Level** On Track

**Monthly Update** We continue to do well! Just got our 24th school (goal is 54). Still waiting to re-approach a few district-level refusals. Although within-school level response is lower than what was projected -- we need closer to 10%, we are getting more

like 5% -- the clinic has all of their appts booked up for the next several weeks, so they feel recruit is going well. No word yet on request a new replicate of schools before the end of the calendar year. Budget is pretty healthy, however, so we are optimistic. Cautiously optimistic.

### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b>		
<b>Nov 07, 2016</b>	<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	53,075.00
	<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	430,596.00
	<b>Total Budget:</b>	430,596.00
	<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	0.00
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

<b>Projections</b>		
<b>Nov 07, 2016</b>	<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	15,000.00
	<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	15,000.00
	<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	0.00
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

### Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	54		
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	54		
<b>Current actual:</b>	24		
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	54		
<b>Variance:</b>			

### 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:** 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.

**SRO Project Period** 02/2015 - 11/2019

**Data Col Period** 10/2015 - 11/2019

**Security Plan** NA

**Milestone Dates**

**PreProduction Start:** 02/01/2015

**Pretest End:** 03/31/2016

**Staffing Completed:**

**SS Train Start:**

**DC Start:** 09/12/2016

**Pretest Start:** 10/14/2015

**Recruitment Start:**

**GIT Start:**

**SS Train End:**

**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** Nov, 2016 (A-STARRS LS) **Project Phase** Implementing

**Risk Level** Some Concerns

**Monthly Update** Activities for November 2016 include:

Project Management and Planning:

- We continued production data collection through the month. We are sending production updates to the PIs twice weekly, and report on production progress each week on the call with the Army/ODUSA.
- Work with the ODUSA on safety plan and address lookup activities continues to go smoothly. We have received

the entire shipment of study fact brochures, and are receiving shipments of 10,000 challenge coins each month.

- We assigned Meredith House as the lead project manager for STARRS-LS, to replace Margaret Hudson who has taken another position within our organization. Meredith was a key member of the Army STARRS project management team; and is familiar with the project, our staff and the technical systems being used for STARRS-LS. We anticipate a smooth transition. Margaret continue to work part time on STARRS-LS as well.
- We worked with Harvard University to review results from the first two months of data collection and update the cost and response rate assumptions used in the initial five-phase contact protocol.
- We provided Harvard with a preliminary dataset containing survey data from the first eight weeks of data collection. Their review was very positive, with few errors and a small number of change requests that we will implement in the coming months.
- We submitted additional documentation and reviewed the AAG IRB protocol for the GAT data request.
- We provided information to the ODUSA to assist with their request to use Accurint for locating activities.
- We prepared draft slides for the December 15th Government Steering Committee meeting. James Wagner will attend that meeting.

#### Enclave and User Support:

- Members of the Enclave IT team met weekly with AAG and completed their review of outstanding items on the security checklist. AAG submitted a memo approving the security of the Enclave for continued use with Army/DoD data.
- Background check and Flux user access requests have been processed throughout the month. We have added two individuals to assist with drop box reviews, to replace three individuals that have moved off the project.
- Annual training renewal notices were sent to Enclave users (in accordance with Army requirements).
- The enclave team continues to answer user questions and process data transfer requests as needed; and continues to receive, track and process requests for new software and license renewals as needed.
- We prepared and sent a hard drive containing a special pull of Administrative data to AAG.
- We continue to support the analysis teams using the Army STARRS data.
- We are planning to load the first batch of STARRS-LS survey data into the Enclave in February 2017.
- We coordinated PI requests to add an acknowledgement statement to the user agreement for the ICPSR public use data. We also provided information on the number of researchers who have downloaded documentation from the STARRS public use data available through ICPSR.
- We are planning for a webinar on the use of the STARRS public use data on February 9, 2017. The PI's will be involved with the presentations, along with ICPSR staff.

#### Data Collection Progress and Plans:

- Production data collection began September 12; telephone interviewing began October 5.
- As of November 29, the production statistics are as follows:
  - o Replicates released: 1-6, with a total of 9,945 sample lines.
  - o Completed Web interviews: 1,755
  - o Completed CATI interviews: 270
  - o Completed End Game interviews: 23 (19 Web, 4 IVR )
- We made a few adjustments to our calling protocol to take into account the Thanksgiving holiday, and University of Michigan closure days.
- Starting with Replicate #4, we are subselecting 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. This is being done to keep our data collection costs within budget.
- Due to low response rates in the Phase 5 end game for the first two sample replicates, we stopped the end game protocol at the end of Replicate 2. Starting with Replicate 3, all cases are closed out at the end of Phase 4. We will work with Harvard to design a new end game protocol later in the project.
- We continued to evaluate the results from the first replicates as they move through the full contact protocol.
- We provided Harvard with detailed cost and response rate information from the first three replicates of data collection, which is being used to develop the next set of design changes.
- The Michigan team is responsible for following up safety plan cases for study participants that have left the Army. Approximately 35% of the interviews are completed by individuals no longer in the Army; and of those, the safety plan rate is 14.5% (compared with 6% for study participants still in the Army). In November, the Michigan team followed up with 65 respondents needing a safety plan check.
- 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 29 November 2016

Goals	Rep 1	Rep 2	Rep 3	Rep 4	Rep 5	Rep 6			
Replicate Launch Date			12-Sep	26-Sep	10-Oct	24-Oct	7-Nov	21-Nov	
Sample Size	1,006	1,000	1,000	2,313	2,313	2,313			
Total Interviews		395	342	327	474	393	117		
Cumulative Wtd Resp Rate				44.4%*	38.2%	32.7%	25.6%	17.0%	5.1%
Phase 1 (letter, coin)	2%	2.9%*	2.6%*	1.7%*	2.0%*	1.5%*	1.6%*		

Phase 2 (email, text msg)	12%	13.8%*	12.6%*	13.3%*	13.8%*	15.7%	3.5%
Phase 3a (\$100, no calls)	15%	11.6%*	13.2%*	12.7%*	8.9%		
Phase 3b (\$50, calls)	15%	16.2%*	15.2%*	13.6%*	10.6%		
Phase 3c (\$100, calls)	25%	23.5%*	17.1%*	18.9%*	16.1%		
Phase 4a (\$100, calls)	15%	18.5%*	13.1%*	13.7%			
Phase 4b (\$100, no calls)	15%	9.5%*	7.0%*	4.0%			
Phase 4c (\$100, no calls)	0%	2.7%*	2.6%*	3.1%			
Phase 5	15%	10.7%*	7.9%				

\*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 \$290,521 in October 2016 on data collection, interviewer training, production support, project management, and enclave support. We are currently projecting a deficit of \$203,183 for the total project (1.6% of the total budget), decreasing our projected total cost by \$36,028 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 October 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 Sept 2016		\$801,808	\$180,768	\$360,482	\$392,021
	Actual Costs for Oct 2016		\$66,946	\$138,051	\$43,519	\$290,521
	Projected Costs Nov 2016		\$53,174	\$199,800	\$43,591	\$61,026
	Total Year 2 Projected Cost		\$921,928	\$518,619	\$447,592	\$495,052
	Variance (\$347,805)		\$1,458,347	\$15,336	\$123,796	\$1,249,674
Year 3	Budget	\$400,008	\$1,981,395	\$476,249	\$603,408	\$3,461,060
	Year 3 Projected Total Cost		\$473,880	\$2,395,320	\$503,805	\$620,894
	Variance (\$73,872)		(\$413,925)	(\$27,556)	(\$17,486)	(\$532,840)
Year 4	Budget	\$280,594	\$1,055,329	\$410,278	\$654,463	\$2,400,664
	Year 4 Projected Total Cost		\$343,567	\$1,470,755	\$432,813	\$663,047
	Variance (\$62,973)		(\$415,426)	(\$22,535)	(\$8,584)	(\$509,517)
Year 5	Budget	\$263,619	\$805,264	\$418,806	\$636,637	\$2,124,326
	Year 5 Projected Total Cost		\$326,832	\$1,211,349	\$438,186	\$635,867
	Variance (\$63,213)		(\$406,085)	(\$19,380)	\$770	(\$487,907)
Total Budget		\$2,088,910	\$5,874,656	\$2,015,689	\$2,758,978	\$12,738,233
Total Projected Cost at Completion			\$2,570,073	\$5,614,832	\$2,118,035	\$2,638,476
Total Variance			(\$481,163)	\$259,824	(\$102,346)	\$120,502

\*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 early in the project. We will continue to track.
  - o We are working with Harvard to evaluate the cost and response rate tradeoffs for the various experimental conditions, 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.
  - o The request for approval for the ODUSA contractors to submit Social Security Number to Accurant for batch locating is still pending with the Army. In the meantime Michigan will continue to submit the sample to Accurant, 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 overall. 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 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 We have been able to add two individuals to our drop box team this month. That will take some of the pressure off other members of the Enclave team.
  - 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**  
**Nov 10, 2016**

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	3,067,509.00
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	12,941,416.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	12,738,233.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	-203,183.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	The variance is less than 1% 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**  
**Nov 10, 2016**

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	376,264.00
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	290,520.00
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	85,744.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Most of the under-run was due to not using respondent payments as quickly as we anticipated. Those costs have been moved to future months. We also had a small under-run in the total number of hours worked, due to holiday/vacation time off and some work being pushed to future months.

**Measures**

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



**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.

<b>Project Name</b>	CogUSA Tablet and Saliva Collection (CogUSA Saliva)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mail	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 2										
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 171,995.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 266,593.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 266,593.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Jack McArdle (USC) Brooke Helppie (UM/SRC)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	National Institute of Aging (NIA)												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM00001406	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>											
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Joseph Matthew Matuzak <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Dean E Stevens <b>Production Manager:</b> Joseph Matthew Matuzak <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Kirsten Haakan Alcser <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Production Manager:</b>												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	<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>												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	11/2015 - 04/2016												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	01/2016 - 04/2016												
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 11/01/2015</td> <td><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td><b>Recruitment Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Staffing Completed:</b></td> <td><b>GIT Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>SS Train Start:</b></td> <td><b>SS Train End:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DC Start:</b> 01/25/2016</td> <td><b>DC End:</b> 08/30/2016</td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 11/01/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>	<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>	<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>	<b>DC Start:</b> 01/25/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 08/30/2016
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 11/01/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>												
<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>												
<b>DC Start:</b> 01/25/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 08/30/2016												
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun, Dave Dybicki, Minako Edgar, Emily Blasyck, David Bolt												
<b>Other Project Names:</b>													
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	Project specific system (CMS)												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Other (USC program on tablet computer)												
<b>Hardware</b>	Tablet												
<b>DE Software</b>	Other (CMS)												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	N/A												
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R												
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group												
<b>Payment Type</b>	Check, post (\$40); Cash, prepaid (\$2)												
<b>Payment Method</b>	Check through STRak RPay System; Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office												

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (CogUSA Saliva)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Closing
<b>Risk Level</b>	On Track		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	There was no data collection activity over the past month. Final reports and lessons learned are nearing completion ,adn we have been in communication with study staff about getting tablets, data, and report materials to them.		
<b>Special Issues</b>			

**Cost**  
**Nov 09, 2016**

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	248,662.78	
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	248,662.78	
<b>Total Budget:</b>	266,593.00	
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	17,930.22	
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Shipping costs ended up being significantly lower than projected, and the difference on this pretty much matches the expected under-run. There may be a small amount of trailing costs.	

**Projections**  
**Nov 09, 2016**

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

**Measures**

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	400		
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	400		
<b>Current actual:</b>	432		
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	432		
<b>Variance:</b>	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:*** Joseph Matthew Matuzak  
***Budget Analyst:*** Dean E Stevens  
***Production Manager:*** Bridgitte Wyche McGee  
***Senior Project Advisor:*** Kirsten Haakan Alcser  
***Production Manager:*** Joseph Matthew Matuzak  
***Production Manager:*** Bridgitte Wyche McGee

**Proposal #:** no data

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

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

**SRO Project Period** 04/2016 - 02/2017

**Data Col Period** 07/2016 - 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**

Nov, 2016 (DMACS)

**Project Phase**

Implementing

**Risk Level***Some Concerns***Monthly Update**

During November 2016, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Adjusted data collection plan, monthly projections and cost estimates.
- Wave 2 Spanish questionnaire and materials submitted to IRB and approved

Task 2: Sampling

- Additional Wave 2 preload variables defined

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Drafting of Wave 2 support materials completed.
- Wave 2 Spanish translation completed and reviewed

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Wave 1 launched.
- Draft version Wave 2 questionnaire completed, tested, requested revisions defined.

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Daily reports set up, working
- Sample assignment trouble-shooting completed

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment &amp; Hiring, Training

- Weekly Interviewer meetings conducted
- Interviewers identified and trained for PAPI data entry

Task 8: Main Data Collection

- Wave 1 web data collection continued
- Wave 1 Interviewer reminder calls begun
- Respondent Incentive payments processed on a weekly basis
- Wave 1 PAPIs sent out.
- Data entry of returned PAPIs begun
- Data collection continued with good results: 286 completed web surveys, and 199 PAPI interviews completed, which puts us at 68% of goal. 72 PAPI data entered.

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 11/18/2016	\$	90708
Expected cost at complete	\$	272255
Expected Variance:	\$	(15,486)

Cost explanation:

The cost estimate reflects survey funding awarded to Michigan (SRO) for data collection activities, current

expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award.

The cost estimate projects an overrun, principally due to inadvertent under-budgeting of interviewer hours and other expenses at the proposal stage. SRC reviewed and approved an estimated overrun up to \$17,000. The currently projected overrun is slightly lower (\$15,486). We will continue to monitor costs carefully and work with the PIs to keep total costs within the awarded funds plus the SRC approved costs.

#### Special Issues

- Budget/Expenses – The data collection budget continues to be challenging. Most line items are budgeted at the minimum possible amount. Further changes in schedule or design are likely to negatively impact the projected expenses.
- This is considered to be a feasibility study. The design of the study is intended to determine if the proposed sampling and contact plan is a feasible way of developing a web survey panel. Response rates expectations may be optimistic for the sampling/contact plan and schedule.
- The project continues to run behind schedule, primarily due to extended discussions around the final questionnaire versions. We are working with the PIs to finalize the Wave 2 questionnaire. Given the delay in finalizing this instrument, we were not able to reap the benefit of having our DMACS programmer program the Wave 2 questionnaire and needed to find additional TSG resources. We have had some additional delay due to changes in Wave 2 and may need to end up extending data collection to the end of January.

#### Cost Nov 18, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	90,707.90
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	272,255.30
<b>Total Budget:</b>	256,769.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	-15,486.30
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	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 Nov 18, 2016

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	0.00
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	0.00
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	0.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Programming, translation and data collection costs were pushed forward.

#### Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	712		1.0
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	712		1.0
<b>Current actual:</b>	485		
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>			
<b>Variance:</b>			

#### 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><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</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:</td><td>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 RPav System														

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (HCAP 2016)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	Some Concerns		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	As of November 28, we completed 1483 Respondent and 1264 Informant interviews. The current sample is 2988 Respondent and 2988 Informant cases. The next sample release will be done in early January 2017 and is estimated to be approximately 800 cases.		

In early November additional cases were assigned priority, bringing the total count of priority cases to 455. Of those, 235 are interviews and 69 are final non-interviews/non-sample.

#### Special Issues

Cost  
Nov 23, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 2,241,593.00  
**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 5,031,258.00  
**Total Budget:** 4,476,719.00  
**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -554,536.00

**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  
Nov 23, 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
<b>Current Goal:</b>			
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>			
<b>Current actual:</b>			
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>			
<b>Variance:</b>			

#### Other Measures



Project Name	Health and Retirement Study (HRS 2016)																								
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed      Total of Modes: 2																								
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current																					
Budget	Direct Budget:	24,690,534.00	Indirect Budget:	8,888,593.00	Total Budget: 33,579,127.00																				
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (SRC) Mary Beth Ofstedal (SRC) Ken Langa (SRC)																								
Funding Agency	NIA																								
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00061128	Period Of Approval:	1/15/2015 - 1/14/201																					
Project Team	Project Lead:	Nicole G Kirgis																							
	Budget Analyst:	Richard Warren Krause																							
	Production Manager:	Stephanie Sullivan																							
	Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher																							
	Production Manager:	Jennifer C Arrieta																							
	Production Manager:	Piotr Dworak																							
Proposal #:	no data																								
Description:	The Health and Retirement Study (HRS) is a national, longitudinal study conducted every two years since 1992. The study includes a representative sample of US residents aged 50 years and older. Every six years (three waves) a new cohort of US residents aged 50 to 55 are screened in to the study to maintain representativeness. In 2004, the early baby boomers were screened in and completed a baseline interview. In 2010, the mid baby boomer cohort was added as well as a minority oversample of both early and mid-baby boomers. In 2016, the late baby boomer cohort will be added. A series of physical measures and biomarkers are collected with half of all living respondents each wave as well as a self-administered questionnaire. Additionally, permission to link to Social Security Administration records and Veterans Administration (VA) records is requested.																								
SRO Project Period	04/2015 - 06/2017																								
Data Col Period	02/2016 - 04/2017																								
Security Plan	NA																								
Milestone Dates	<table><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</td><td>04/01/2015</td><td>Pretest Start:</td><td>10/16/2015</td></tr><tr><td>Pretest End:</td><td>11/07/2015</td><td>Recruitment Start:</td><td>06/01/2015</td></tr><tr><td>Staffing Completed:</td><td>03/15/2016</td><td>GIT Start:</td><td>02/10/2016</td></tr><tr><td>SS Train Start:</td><td>02/12/2016</td><td>SS Train End:</td><td>04/24/2016</td></tr><tr><td>DC Start:</td><td>02/22/2016</td><td>DC End:</td><td>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																								

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (HRS 2016)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	Some Concerns		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	During the month of November, data collection for the new cohort and panel components continued. Decisions were made to focus production effort on panel sample to ensure it is completed by the end of April 2017 as well as brainstorming strategies for screener and baseline interviewing. In addition, 938 new cohort cases were flagged for additional token offer to provide interviewers an additional tool when speaking with new cohort respondents about the study and participation.		

Technical Development: During the month of November, the Tech team focused on updating SurveyTrak for the main and screener projects as. Further development in production systems continues (including WebTrak and WebLog). A new data model was released to the field to account for the presidential election results.

#### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b> <b>Oct 31, 2016</b>	<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	22,589,545.71	
	<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	33,516,833.35	
	<b>Total Budget:</b>	33,579,127.00	
	<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	62,293.65	
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Projection refinements are ongoing for both Panel and New Cohort.	

<b>Projections</b> <b>Oct 31, 2016</b>	<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	2,200,609.48	
	<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	1,664,476.54	
	<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	536,132.90	
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Actual dollars for the month of October came in significantly under projections due to coming in under projections for respondent tokens, interviewer bonus payments, and interviewer hours. About \$300K is being pushed forward.	

<b>Measures</b>		<b>Units Complete</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>HPI</b>
<b>Current Goal:</b>	24,162		88.5%	7.45
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	24,162		88.5	7.45
<b>Current actual:</b>	14,881		55%	6.9
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	24,162		88.5	7.45
<b>Variance:</b>				

<b>Other Measures</b>	Goal for New Cohort is 5,228 interviews. Goal for Panel lws is 18,934 interviews.
-----------------------	--

<b>Project Name</b>	Housing & Children (HCDC, H&C)			
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Face to Face      Total of Modes: 1			
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	7,449,944.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	1,684,468.00
			<b>Total Budget:</b>	9,134,412.00

**Principal Investigator/Client**

**Funding Agency**

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

**Project Team**

<b>Project Lead:</b>	Grant D Benson
<b>Budget Analyst:</b>	William Lokers
<b>Production Manager:</b>	Barbara Aghababian-Homburg
<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Mary P Maher
<b>Production Manager:</b>	Barbara Lohr Ward
<b>Production Manager:</b>	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**

<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 04/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> 10/24/2016
<b>Pretest End:</b> 12/31/2016	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2016
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b> 05/09/2017
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 05/11/2017	<b>SS Train End:</b> 05/22/2017
<b>DC Start:</b> 05/26/2017	<b>DC End:</b> 05/24/2018

**Other Project**

**Team Members:**

**Other Project****Names:****Sample Mgmt Sys****Data Col Tool****Hardware****DE Software****QC Recording Tool****Incentive****Administration****Payment Type****Payment Method**

SurveyTrak; SMS

Blaise 4.8; SAQ

Laptop; Desktop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (laser measurement device)

Blaise 4.8 BIA ; External vendor (TBD)

DRI-CARI

Yes, R; Yes, INF; Yes, Other (screening households)

SRO Group

Cash, prepaid (\$5 for subsample); Cash, post (\$75 adult, \$50 child); Other (child gift &lt;\$5, Finders fee \$10, child

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

**Report Period**

Nov, 2016 (HCDC, H&amp;C)

**Project Phase**

Implementing

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

During November 2016, SRO activities included the following:

## Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

## % Task Spent to Date

- Held regular meetings with the research team to discuss design, deliverables, schedule, funding.
- Revised and updated project schedule.
- Prepared invoices and invoice documentation. Updated invoice receivables schedule.
- Reviewed/monitored spending compared to budget. Adjusted and revised monthly projections
- Adjusted reports for monitoring Pilot production.
- Conducted debriefing on Training activities.
- Investigated alternative lancets. Conducted internal tests on lancets.
- Prepared and submitted IRB modification for child blood spot protocol change.
- Developed use-cases for testing screening assumptions.
- Reviewed/prepared data files for delivery, updated delivery documentation.

## Task 2: Sampling

## % Task Spent to Date

- Monitored performance of Pilot sample.
- Created supplemental sample for the Pilot.
- Matched addresses to phone numbers.

## Task 3: Questionnaire Development

## % Task Spent to Date

- Pilot Production
  - o Held weekly meetings with Interviewers and Team Leaders
  - ☐ Discussed production challenges
  - ☐ Debriefed on training, technical systems design
  - o Logging
    - ☐ Logged incoming SAQs, Child Time Diaries
  - 19 HH SAQs
  - 24 Child-specific SAQs
  - 3 Child Time Diary sets
  - ☐ Logged/conducted QC on dried blood spot cards
  - o Data Entry - Conducted initial trial data entry of SAQs
  - o Interviewing Progress as of 11/28/2016
    - ☐ Screening Production
      - 684 households with attempted contact (attempts on all households in the sample)
      - 63 eligible households identified
      - 166 ineligible households identified, 150 non-sample addresses, 52 non-interviews
      - 27 completed PCG interviews, 30 completed Child interviews
      - 2 appointments
      - ☐ Reminder calls – produced coversheets and conducted reminder calls for Child Time Diary completion
    - Interviewing Systems Maintenance and Development, Preparation for Main Production
    - o Child Interview
      - ☐ Conducted extensive iterative integrated testing. Made updates to instrument and sample management system pre-load and post-load as necessary to resolve integration issues.
      - ☐ Fully documented programming of Child Interview – updated specifications to reflect all programmed instructions.
    - o Post Interview Observations
      - ☐ Documented suggested changes for Main Production.
    - o Adult CAPI Questionnaire

- Conducted extensive iterative integrated testing. Made updates to pre-load and post-load as necessary to resolve integration issues.
- Fully documented programming of PCG Interview – updated specifications to reflect all programmed instructions.
- o Screening Questionnaire
- Developed additional testing scenarios and use cases.
- Conducted extensive iterative integrated testing.
- o Fully documented programming of screening interview – updated specifications to reflect all programmed instructions. Began preparing programming updates for main production. Contact Observations
- Tested contact observations, updated specification.

#### Task 4: CAI Programming

##### % Task Spent to Date

- Child
- o Conducted iterative testing & programming.
- o Updated pre-load and post-load to resolve integration problems
- o Tested Inquisite version of Hearts & Flowers
- PCG
- o Conducted iterative testing & programming.
- o Updated pre-load and post-load to resolve integration problems
- Post Interview Observations
- o Conducted iterative testing & programming.
- Contact Observations
- o Fixed bugs, conducted iterative testing & programming.
- Data Entry Applications
- o Programmed data entry applications for SAQs, Child Time Diary
- o Conducted iterative testing/bug fixes

#### 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.
- Updated programming for production reports.
- Began programming logging applications

#### Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

##### % Task Spent to Date

- Specified RFQs for May 2016 training

#### 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

- Set up SFTP for data delivery
- Prepared and delivered pilot data files

#### Areas of Concern:

- The rate of non-sample due to non-English speakers is higher than expected, leading to a lower number of completed interviews for the Pilot. SRC is investigating the possibility of releasing more sample and extending the production end date by two weeks in order to increase the number of completed interviews.
- Child blood spot collection:
  - o The lancet initially selected for child dried blood spots is not producing sufficient sample for analysis. SRC investigated alternatives through the UM Clinical Research program, and conducted an in-house trial draw on SRC staff persons. Three potential lancets were identified. An IRB modification was prepared and submitted requesting permission to change the lancet size.

- o Interviewers reported that the blood spot assent language in the Child Interview (language initially requested by the IRB) was causing children to refuse the measure. Alternative language developed in collaboration with SRC Interviewers was drafted and submitted for IRB approval.
- o The second child dried blood spot assent rate is very low. SRC will continue to work with the SRC Interviewers and the research team to develop strategies to alleviate refusals from the second child.
- The rate of return for the Child Time Diary is very low, despite reminder calling. SRC will work with the research team to develop a strategy to increase the return rate for this component of data collection.
- Considerably more training videos, which cover the full range of interaction behaviors, were 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. Additional effort will be required to code, train, and certify interviewers for a full and consistent implementation of the measure. Hearts and Flowers: 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. SRC is testing the New York University Inquisitive version of Hearts and Flowers as a potential alternative for 2017 production.

## Special Issues

### Areas of Concern:

- The rate of non-sample due to non-English speakers is higher than expected, leading to a lower number of completed interviews for the Pilot. SRC is investigating the possibility of releasing more sample and extending the production end date by two weeks in order to increase the number of completed interviews.
- Child blood spot collection:
  - o The lancet initially selected for child dried blood spots is not producing sufficient sample for analysis. SRC investigated alternatives through the UM Clinical Research program, and conducted an in-house trial draw on SRC staff persons. Three potential lancets were identified. An IRB modification was prepared and submitted requesting permission to change the lancet size.
  - o Interviewers reported that the blood spot assent language in the Child Interview (language initially requested by the IRB) was causing children to refuse the measure. Alternative language developed in collaboration with SRC Interviewers was drafted and submitted for IRB approval.
  - o The second child dried blood spot assent rate is very low. SRC will continue to work with the SRC Interviewers and the research team to develop strategies to alleviate refusals from the second child.
  - The rate of return for the Child Time Diary is very low, despite reminder calling. SRC will work with the research team to develop a strategy to increase the return rate for this component of data collection.
  - Considerably more training videos, which cover the full range of interaction behaviors, were 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. Additional effort will be required to code, train, and certify interviewers for a full and consistent implementation of the measure. Hearts and Flowers: 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. SRC is testing the New York University Inquisitive version of Hearts and Flowers as a potential alternative for 2017 production.

### 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

Nov 30, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	802,708.53
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	9,134,412.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	9,134,412.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	0.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

Projections  
Nov 30, 2016

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	193,231.00
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	103,239.00
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	89,992.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Several large invoices are outstanding - hosting/hotel for interviewers, and sample purchase. Respondent payments are lower than anticipated due to the slow level of production.

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

<b>Project Name</b>	Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study (MTTS)				
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mail	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 2		
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current		
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 693,562.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 382,855.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 1,076,417.00		
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Heather Hill (Harvard Graduate School of Education) Patty Maher (ISR PI)				
<b>Funding Agency</b>					
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM90379	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	6/25/2014-6/25/2015		
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Barbara Lohr Ward <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Dean E Stevens <b>Production Manager:</b> Russell W Stark <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Stephanie A Chardoul <b>Production Manager:</b> Anthony Romanowski <b>Production Manager:</b>				
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data				
<b>Description:</b>	<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 &amp; 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>				
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	09/2014 - 06/2016				
<b>Data Col Period</b>	01/2015 - 12/2015				
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA				
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>PreProduction Start:</b> 10/01/2014  <b>Pretest End:</b>  <b>Staffing Completed:</b>  <b>SS Train Start:</b>  <b>DC Start:</b> 03/02/2015 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>Pretest Start:</b>  <b>Recruitment Start:</b> 01/26/2015  <b>GIT Start:</b>  <b>SS Train End:</b>  <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2016 </td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 10/01/2014 <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b> 03/02/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> 01/26/2015 <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2016
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 10/01/2014 <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b> 03/02/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> 01/26/2015 <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2016				
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	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:**

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

---

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (MTTS)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Closing
----------------------	------------------	----------------------	---------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	During Nov, 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

- 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 10/31/2016	\$	924,610
Expected cost at complete	\$	1,011,564
Expected Variance:	\$	64,853

**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**

Nov 09, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 924,610.00

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 1,011,564.00

**Total Budget:** 1,076,417.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 64,853.00

**Reason For Variance:** We are awaiting a deobligation of \$57000, which will reduce the projected underrun.

**Projections**

Nov 09, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 10,403.00

**Actual Dollars Used:** 10,524.00

**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 121.00

**Reason For Variance:**

**Measures**

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

**Other Measures**

**Project Name** Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot (MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illume Web 2016)

**Project Mode** Primary: Web Secondary: Mail Total of Modes: 2

**Project Type** Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

**Budget** **Direct Budget:** 280,748.00 **Indirect Budget:** 154,410.00 **Total Budget:** 435,158.00

**Principal Investigator/Client** Megan Patrick (UM-SRC)

**Funding Agency** U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, National Institutes of Health

**IRB** **HUM#:** 00081391 **Period Of Approval:** 8/1/2012 - 4/30/2017

**Project Team** **Project Lead:** Donnalee Ann Grey-Farquharson  
**Budget Analyst:** Christine Evanchek  
**Production Manager:** Lloyd Fate Hemingway  
**Senior Project Advisor:** Gina-Qian Yang Cheung  
**Production Manager:**  
**Production Manager:**

**Proposal #:** no data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SRO Project Period** 08/2012 - 08/2017

**Data Col Period** 04/2016 - 08/2016

**Security Plan** Yes

**Milestone Dates**

**PreProduction Start:**

**Pretest 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 (Years 1, 2) Lloyd Hemingway, Shaowei Sun (year 3 only), Jennie Williams, Peter Sparks, Dave Dybicki

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

**Report Period** Nov, 2016 (MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illu **Project Phase** Implementing

**Risk Level** *Not Rated*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b>	<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	273,454.49
<b>Oct 31, 2016</b>	<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	430,783.90
	<b>Total Budget:</b>	435,158.00
	<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	4,374.10
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

<b>Projections</b>	<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	15,199.16
<b>Oct 31, 2016</b>	<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	16,654.17
	<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	-1,455.01
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

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

**Other Measures**

<b>Project Name</b>	MTF Base Year Tablet Pilot (MTF Tablet Pilot)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Class SAQ      Total of Modes: 1												
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 342,799.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 188,540.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 531,339.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Richard Miech (UM-SRC)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). Fall-only budget, direct: \$67,163.00; Indir:\$36,940.00; Total:\$104,103.00												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> N/A	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	N/A										
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Meredith A House <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Christine Evanchek <b>Production Manager:</b> Barbara Aghababian-Homburg <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Stephanie A Chardoul <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Production Manager:</b>												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	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.												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	06/2015 - 10/2016												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	10/2015 - 06/2016												
<b>Security Plan</b>	Yes												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>PreProduction Start:</b></td> <td><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td><b>Recruitment Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Staffing Completed:</b></td> <td><b>GIT Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/14/2016</td> <td><b>SS Train End:</b> 11/16/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DC Start:</b> 10/13/2016</td> <td><b>DC End:</b> 12/09/2012</td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>	<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>	<b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/14/2016	<b>SS Train End:</b> 11/16/2016	<b>DC Start:</b> 10/13/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 12/09/2012
<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>												
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/14/2016	<b>SS Train End:</b> 11/16/2016												
<b>DC Start:</b> 10/13/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 12/09/2012												
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	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.												
<b>Other Project Names:</b>	MTF Fall 2015 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 2016 Tablet Pilot												
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Other (SurveyCTO)												
<b>Hardware</b>	Tablet												
<b>DE Software</b>	Other (Google Form)												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	N/A												
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R; Yes, Other (Schools)												
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group												
<b>Payment Type</b>	Check, prepaid (\$1,000 (fall 2015 schools only)); Check, post (\$500 or \$1000 (spring-fall 2016 schools)); Cash,												
<b>Payment Method</b>	Check through other system (Rpay spreadsheet); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (Rpay spreadsh												

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (MTF Tablet Pilot)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	------------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	Nov activities:
-----------------------	-----------------

We held a second phone training for the Florida and Illinois field staff on 11/14. These schools were tentative at the time of the first training and we had not identified staff yet.

An administration was held November 17 (FL). The Florida admin went well and the FRs and helpers like the launcher applications. It was a mass admin of about 240 students - the field staff commented that it was the quietest mass admin they had ever experienced. The IL admin will take place 12/2.

Meredith and Kyle have been working with TSG admin to secure resources for the additional form programming and

app development for spring 2017.

**Special Issues**

<b>Cost</b> Nov 30, 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>	

<b>Projections</b> Nov 30, 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>	

<b>Measures</b>	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**

<b>Project Name</b>	National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG 2010-2020)													
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Face to Face      Total of Modes: 1													
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	32,653,126.47	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	8,448,262.00 <b>Total Budget:</b> 41,101,388.47										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Joyce Abma (NCHS) Mick Couper (ISR)													
<b>Funding Agency</b>	NCHS, CDC, NICHD													
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	0002716	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	7/17/13 - 7/17/17										
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Heidi Marie Guyer <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Nancy Oeffner <b>Production Manager:</b> Theresa Camelo <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Mary P Maher <b>Production Manager:</b> Maureen Joan O'Brien <b>Production Manager:</b> Rebecca Loomis													
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data													
<b>Description:</b>	<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>													
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	09/2010 - 07/2020													
<b>Data Col Period</b>	09/2011 - 06/2019													
<b>Security Plan</b>	Yes													
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 03/01/2011</td> <td><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td><b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Staffing Completed:</b> 08/17/2011</td> <td><b>GIT Start:</b> 09/13/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/15/2011</td> <td><b>SS Train End:</b> 09/19/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DC Start:</b> 09/20/2011</td> <td><b>DC End:</b> 07/01/2019</td> </tr> </table>				<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 03/01/2011	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2011	<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 08/17/2011	<b>GIT Start:</b> 09/13/2011	<b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/15/2011	<b>SS Train End:</b> 09/19/2011	<b>DC Start:</b> 09/20/2011	<b>DC End:</b> 07/01/2019
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 03/01/2011	<b>Pretest Start:</b>													
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2011													
<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 08/17/2011	<b>GIT Start:</b> 09/13/2011													
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/15/2011	<b>SS Train End:</b> 09/19/2011													
<b>DC Start:</b> 09/20/2011	<b>DC End:</b> 07/01/2019													
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst													
<b>Other Project Names:</b>														
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak													
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Blaise 4.8													
<b>Hardware</b>	Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil													
<b>DE Software</b>	NA													
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	N/A													
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R; Yes, Other (babysitting fee)													
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group													
<b>Payment Type</b>	Cash, prepaid (\$5; \$40); Cash, post (\$40; \$60)													
<b>Payment Method</b>	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office													

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (NSFG 2010-2020)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	On Track		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	<p>Interviewer attrition has been particularly high this year due to both typical new hire interviewer attrition as well as active removal of interviewers who are not meeting performance criteria despite multiple warnings. An attrition planning will be held in January 2017 with close to 20 interviewers. This will be the largest attrition training to date. The high rate of attrition is affecting interview yield in the current quarter and will likely effect next quarter as well as the new interviewers will not begin until week 4 or 5 of the quarter. Production challenges have been issued to the field to increase interviews and response rates in the current quarter. Additionally, the quarter will be extended by 4 days and continue until Wednesday, December 21st rather than ending on Saturday, December 17th as originally planned. NCHS received proposed questionnaire changes from the various funding agencies in mid-October. Updated</p>		



questionnaire specs will need to be provided to SRO by March 2017 in order to have all changes implemented and tested by June 2017. NSFG will also transition to the EDU for collecting signed consent and payment receipts in January 2017. Additionally, CDC is requiring all studies to include language regarding the potential risk of a security breach in all study materials including precontact letters and brochures 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. Cost projections for the current year and future years will be revisited. New ideas for recruiting and hiring of field staff are also being explored.

### Cost Nov 09, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 26,791,907.21

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 43,300,899.73

**Total Budget:** 41,101,388.47

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -2,199,501.26

**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. Annual budgets for the remaining contract years are also expected to exceed the contract amount. NCHS and the funders are aware of this.

### Projections Nov 09, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 458,507.75

**Actual Dollars Used:** 453,520.82

**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 4,986.93

**Reason For Variance:**

Projections were within one percent of actual costs.

### Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	1250	70%	9.0
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	1350	75%	9.0
<b>Current actual:</b>	1142	55%	9.6
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	1300	70%	9.8
<b>Variance:</b>	50	5%	.8

### Other Measures

The goals are for the quarter. The actuals shown above are through week 10 of quarter 21.

<b>Project Name</b>	Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior (AHRB)				
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Class SAQ	Secondary: Web	Total of Modes: 2		
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current		
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 815,655.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 452,688.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 1,268,343.00		
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Daniel Keating (U-M SRC)				
<b>Funding Agency</b>	Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of-National Institutes of Health				
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM00084650	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	2/3/2016 - 2/2/2017		
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Peter Rakesh Batra <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Dean E Stevens <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Stephanie A Chardoul <b>Production Manager:</b> Meredith A House <b>Production Manager:</b>				
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data				
<b>Description:</b>	<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>				
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	04/2014 - 03/2018				
<b>Data Col Period</b>	03/2015 - 01/2016				
<b>Security Plan</b>	Yes				
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>PreProduction Start:</b>  <b>Pretest End:</b>  <b>Staffing Completed:</b>  <b>SS Train Start:</b>  <b>DC Start:</b> 09/01/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>Pretest Start:</b>  <b>Recruitment Start:</b>  <b>GIT Start:</b>  <b>SS Train End:</b>  <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2018 </td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b> 09/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2018
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b> 09/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2018				
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	<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>				

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

Report Period	Nov, 2016 (AHRB)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	<p>Oct activities: We have been testing changes to the Portal, the emailer client, the neurocognitive tasks and changes to respondent contact information (SRIS). The delay has given us the opportunity to test these changes more thoroughly and greater attention to detail.</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 December.</p>		
Special Issues	<p>We are still concerned about the launch timeline due to the changes requested and delay. We have a decision on the incentive at the end of October, and now the plan is to send W2 invitation letters out during the first week of January. Prior to sending invitations to the survey we need to submit an IRB amendment for questionnaire and document changes, receive approval, print and mail the contact info/consent materials, allow a minimum of 2 weeks for parent opt-out. We have a meeting scheduled with the PI in the first week of December.</p>		
Cost			
Nov 30, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	1,011,193.67	
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,438,416.33	
	Total Budget:	1,268,343.00	
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	170,073.33	
	Reason For Variance:	The projections do not include the smoothing agreement that Dean will reconcile in the budget in Jan 2017	
Projections			
Nov 30, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	30,506.00	
	Actual Dollars Used:	31,322.00	
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	816.00	
	Reason For Variance:		

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

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**

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

**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** Nov, 2016 (YRS)      **Project Phase** Implementing

**Risk Level** On Track

**Monthly Update** Interviewing continues to go well with six month follow-ups. We have received the increased funding for Study 2 (supplement) and are now requesting account set up for these funds.

We are continuing to discuss with the PI changes to consider for Study 2. We meet regularly with her to review suggestions made by SSL.

PI would still like higher RR. We are looking at cases where parent provided information on youth and whether these can be counted as partials. We are looking at other strategies for Study 2 to boost RR (refusal conversion letter, increased incentive).

#### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b> Nov 30, 2016	<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	800,590.36
	<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	1,341,974.67
	<b>Total Budget:</b>	1,423,227.00
	<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	2,877.33
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

<b>Projections</b> Nov 30, 2016	<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	50,039.01
	<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	43,523.12
	<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	6,515.89
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	As sample declines less interviewer hours needed, no more 3 month interviews, finishing up the six month interviews

<b>Measures</b>	<b>Units Complete</b>			<b>RR</b>	<b>HPI</b>
	<b>Current Goal:</b>	3331		85%	3.0
	<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	4200		85%	3.0
	<b>Current actual:</b>	3564		69%	1.2
	<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>			70%	
	<b>Variance:</b>				

**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><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</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: 07/05/2016</td><td>DC End: 10/19/2016</td></tr></table>					PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start:	SS Train End:	DC Start: 07/05/2016	DC End: 10/19/2016
PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:														
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:														
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:														
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:														
DC Start: 07/05/2016	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)														

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (PSID All Stars)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Closing
<b>Risk Level</b>	On Track		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	In November, we handled a few data-related questions from PSID staff and PI. Work is closing down.		
<b>Special Issues</b>	<p>Loose ends status - 1) PSID responded that they do not need Jennie to merge back onto the data files certain preload variables that were not needed in systems or for reports; 2) It has not been determined yet whether we are delivering the authentication paradata. TSG worked on some analyses of these data and created a PPT presentation (could we share this with the PSID team....?) 3) PSID staff asked for timings for one core '15 case where the ADT was corrupt (for comparison to All Stars survey timings) - Meredith to review raw ADT; 4) Q about missing session paradata for one AS case.</p>		

**Cost**  
**Nov 30, 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**  
**Nov 30, 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**

<b>Project Name</b>	PSID Wellbeing (PSID-WB)				
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mixed      Total of Modes: 3				
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current		
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 455,760.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 250,668.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 706,428.00		
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Vicki Freedman (UM-SRC)				
<b>Funding Agency</b>	National Institute on Aging				
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM00109415	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	1/21/16 - 1/20/17		
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Rachel Anne LeClere <b>Budget Analyst:</b> William Lokers <b>Production Manager:</b> Derek Dubuque <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Stephanie A Chardoul <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Production Manager:</b>				
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data				
<b>Description:</b>	<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>				
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	10/2015 - 09/2016				
<b>Data Col Period</b>	NA				
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA				
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>PreProduction Start:</b>  <b>Pretest End:</b>  <b>Staffing Completed:</b>  <b>SS Train Start:</b>  <b>DC Start:</b> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>Pretest Start:</b>  <b>Recruitment Start:</b>  <b>GIT Start:</b>  <b>SS Train End:</b>  <b>DC End:</b> </td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b>
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b>				
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	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				
<b>Other Project Names:</b>	PSID Web/Mail 2016 FES Wellbeing and Daily Life				
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	Web SMS				
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Illume; SAQ				
<b>Hardware</b>	Other (R hardware)				
<b>DE Software</b>	Illume				
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	DRI-CXM				
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R				
<b>Administration</b>	ISR Group (SRC-PSID)				
<b>Payment Type</b>	Check, post (\$20); Cash, prepaid (\$5)				
<b>Payment Method</b>	Check through other system (PSID_RAPS)				

<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (PSID-WB)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	--------------



**Risk Level**                      *Not Rated*

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

**Special Issues**

**Cost**  
**Nov 30, 2016**

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	633,746.86
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	668,682.93
<i>Total Budget:</i>	706,428.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

**Projections**  
**Nov 30, 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**

<b>Project Name</b>	Social Networks and Well Being (SN&WB)					
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Face to Face      Secondary: Telephone					
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current		
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	516,716.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	284,195.00 <b>Total Budget:</b> 800,911.00		
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Kira Birdett (University of Michigan) Karen Fingerman (University of Texas at Austin)					
<b>Funding Agency</b>						
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	2015-02-0123	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	4/15/16-4/15/17		
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Heidi Marie Guyer				
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>					
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Kathleen S Ladronka				
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Kirsten Haakan Alcser				
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Russell W Stark				
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Esther H Ullman				
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data					
<b>Description:</b>	<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>					
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	01/2016 - 04/2017					
<b>Data Col Period</b>						
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA					
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>PreProduction Start:</b> 01/01/2016  <b>Pretest End:</b>  <b>Staffing Completed:</b> 07/25/2016  <b>SS Train Start:</b> 10/17/2016  <b>DC Start:</b> 10/22/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <b>Pretest Start:</b>  <b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/15/2016  <b>GIT Start:</b> 08/27/2016  <b>SS Train End:</b> 10/20/2016  <b>DC End:</b> </td> </tr> </table>				<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 01/01/2016 <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> 07/25/2016 <b>SS Train Start:</b> 10/17/2016 <b>DC Start:</b> 10/22/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/15/2016 <b>GIT Start:</b> 08/27/2016 <b>SS Train End:</b> 10/20/2016 <b>DC End:</b>
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 01/01/2016 <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> 07/25/2016 <b>SS Train Start:</b> 10/17/2016 <b>DC Start:</b> 10/22/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/15/2016 <b>GIT Start:</b> 08/27/2016 <b>SS Train End:</b> 10/20/2016 <b>DC End:</b>					
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Karl Dinkelmann, Marsha Skoman, Lisa Quist, Holly Ackerman, Dan Zahs, Paul Burton, Grace Tison, Suzanne Hodge					
<b>Other Project Names:</b>	Daily Experiences and Well-Being (DEWS)					
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak					
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Blaise 4.8; SAQ; Other (mEMA and EAR app on Android, Actical)					
<b>Hardware</b>	Laptop; Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (Android device, Actical device)					
<b>DE Software</b>	NA					
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	DRI-CARI; Live monitoring					
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R					
<b>Administration</b>	NA					
<b>Payment Type</b>	Cash, prepaid (\$1); Cash, post (\$50 + \$100)					
<b>Payment Method</b>	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office					

Report Period	Nov, 2016 (SN&WB)	Project Phase	Initiation																								
Risk Level	Some Concerns																										
Monthly Update	Production was underway in November and the PI's carefully reviewed data from the first two weeks of Production. No major changes were required (these first interviews served as a "pilot" to review procedures). Additional changes were made for mEMA and EAR administration but these were minor and were able to be implemented while production continued.																										
Special Issues	Due to the complexity of the administration of the interview (baseline and then 5 days of additional devices) we are still evaluating what the total HPI will be and the impact of this on the budget. We also spent considerable resources on development of systems in pre-production and anticipate we will need more hours for management in production. These issues are being discussed with PI.																										
Cost																											
Nov 30, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	345,594.88																									
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	822,129.93																									
	Total Budget:	800,911.00																									
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-21,218.93																									
	Reason For Variance:	Unsure actual HPI for production, will adjust as data collection is underway. Will need more management hours. Potential overrun presented to PI for discussion																									
Projections																											
Nov 30, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	144,699.30																									
	Actual Dollars Used:	133,133.75																									
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	11,565.55																									
	Reason For Variance:	Actual hours were higher than projected but more from management categories (for training) than from programming so overall charges less this month-																									
Measures	<table><tr><th></th><th>Units Complete</th><th>RR</th><th>HPI</th></tr><tr><td>Current Goal:</td><td>60</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>59</td><td>.27</td><td>13.4</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:	60			Goal at Completion:	300		8.8	Current actual:	59	.27	13.4	Estimate at Complete:				Variance:			
	Units Complete	RR	HPI																								
Current Goal:	60																										
Goal at Completion:	300		8.8																								
Current actual:	59	.27	13.4																								
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.																										

<b>Project Name</b>	Surveys of Consumer Attitudes (SCA 2016)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Telephone      Total of Modes: 1												
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 697,302.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 0.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 697,302.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Dr. Richard T. Curtin (SRC)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	Bloomberg, others for Riders.												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>											
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Joseph Matthew Matuzak											
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>	Dean E Stevens											
	<b>Production Manager:</b>												
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Mary P Maher											
	<b>Production Manager:</b>												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	<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>												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	01/2016 - 12/2016												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	01/2016 - 12/2016												
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>PreProduction Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Recruitment Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Staffing Completed:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>GIT Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train End:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC End:</b></td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>	<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>	<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>	<b>DC Start:</b>	<b>DC End:</b>
<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>												
<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>												
<b>DC Start:</b>	<b>DC End:</b>												
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Dave Dybicki Ann Munster Kelley Popielarz Pamela Swanson Jennie Williams LaVelvet Harrison												
<b>Other Project Names:</b>													
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	NA												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	NA												
<b>Hardware</b>	NA												
<b>DE Software</b>	NA												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	NA												
<b>Incentive</b>	NA												
<b>Administration</b>	NA												
<b>Payment Type</b>	NA												
<b>Payment Method</b>	NA												
<b>Report Period</b>	Nov, 2016 (SCA 2016)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing										
<b>Risk Level</b>	Some Concerns												
<b>Monthly Update</b>	SCA completed its November study on time, finishing the targeted total and the desired split between RDD and Recon completes two days early and then pushing on to complete additional interviews at the behest of the PI. In all, 610												

interviews were completed, 407 RDDs and 203 Recons. This was done with an instrument of 26.8 minutes, using 1792.3 interviewer hours and a 2.94 HPI. Newer interviewers continued to be integrated into the study, but we did not add any more interviewers other than one who is returning to the study as a team leader. SCA continued to work expanded weekend hours and to have more daytime TL coverage, so two additional TLs were identified.

**Special Issues**

Getting interview coding done in time for prelim continues to be a concern, and another SSA is being trained on coding the assist with this. Overtime hours were devoted to coding in November.

**Cost**

Nov 09, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 687,564.57

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 845,379.63

**Total Budget:** 697,302.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -148,077.63

**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**

Nov 09, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 56,711.00

**Actual Dollars Used:** 1,125.04

**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 0.00

**Reason For Variance:**

The PI decided to continue gathering interviews in order to assess the impact of the election on the mood of respondents. This meant additional effort and costs.

**Measures**

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>			
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	570	9	2.80
<b>Current actual:</b>			
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	610	8	2.94
<b>Variance:</b>	40	-1	0.01

**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**

<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>
<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>
<b>DC Start:</b> 10/21/2015	<b>DC End:</b>

**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** Nov, 2016 (SCIP-2015)      **Project Phase** Closing

**Risk Level** On Track

**Monthly Update** November '16

-No work was done in October. Received the final October cost report and forwarded to the PI to settle the outstanding balance. Project manager worked on the final report to deliver in early December. This project will be closed out after the December monthly report to capture the final report and the transfer of funds from Graham to ISR.

## 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

Nov 30, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 59,841.26

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 59,841.26

**Total Budget:** 69,535.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 9,693.74

**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

Nov 30, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 0.00

**Actual Dollars Used:** 0.00

**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 0.00

**Reason For Variance:** October '16 - No hours were projected. Due to a time sheet adjustment September hours hit in October.  
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.  
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.

April '16 - Unused projections moved forward.

March '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.

February '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.

January '16 - The reason for the large difference, is the incentives were projected in January. Those projections are being moved forward.

December '15 - Unused data analyst hours. This will be needed and moved forward.

November '15 - Unused data analyst hours. This will be needed and moved forward.

October '15- Unused project manager hours and data analyst hours due to other projects. Unused moved forward.

August '15 - Unused project manager hours and data analyst hours due to other projects and vacations. Unused moved forward.

July '15 - Unused project manager hours due to other projects. Moved forward.

Measures	Units Complete		RR	HPI
	<i>Current Goal:</i>		30%	NA
	<i>Goal at Completion:</i>			NA
	<i>Current actual:</i>		26%	NA
	<i>Estimate at Complete:</i>			NA
	<i>Variance:</i>			NA

Other Measures