

Survey Research Operations

Monthly Project Report

Sponsored Projects

December 2016



Sponsored Projects

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

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 End:

Staffing Completed: 05/20/2016

SS Train Start:

DC Start: 05/20/2016

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start: 05/20/2016

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

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 Dec, 2016 (ABCD) **Project Phase** Implementing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update We added five schools right before the holiday break, so we are currently at 37 schools (goal is 54) and we are meeting with Ann Arbor school administrators on 1/13/17, so it is hopeful we will be able to add the district. Clinic had

a disappointing number of no-shows in December, but otherwise their numbers are good.

Special Issues

None

Cost

Nov 20, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	71,000.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	430,596.00
Total Budget:	430,596.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections

Nov 20, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	22,525.00
Actual Dollars Used:	18,548.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	We continue to be under budget.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	54		
Goal at Completion:	54		
Current actual:	37		
Estimate at Complete:	54		
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study (A-STARRS LS)																													
Project Mode	Primary: Web		Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 3																										
Project Type	Sponsored Projects			Project Status	Current																									
Budget	Direct Budget:	8,218,215.00	Indirect Budget:	4,520,018.00	Total Budget: 12,738,233.00																									
Principal Investigator/Client	James Wagner (University of Michigan) Robert Ursano (Uniformed Services University of the Health Scienc) Murray Stein (University of California San Diego)																													
Funding Agency	Department of Defense																													
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00099203	Period Of Approval:	2/18/2016-2/17/2017																										
Project Team	Project Lead:	Nancy J Gebler																												
	Budget Analyst:	William Lokers																												
	Production Manager:	Ruth B Philippou																												
	Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher																												
	Production Manager:	Meredith A House																												
	Production Manager:	Margaret Lee Hudson																												
Proposal #:	no data																													
Description:	This project is a continuation of the Army STARRS study (Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers). For STARRS LS, we will attempt to reinterview all respondents form the All Army Study (AAS), New Soldier Study (NSS) and Pre-Post Deployment Study (PPDS) samples using a web-phone multi mode study. Each of the approximately 70,000 eligible respondents will be invited to participate once every two years. In addition to reinterviewing the AAS, NSS and PPDS samples; STARRS LS will continue to maintain and support the Research Data Enclave, allowing members of the research team and collaborators to analyze primary Army STARRS data as well as de-identified historical administrative data received from the Army and Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, STARRS LS will continue to receive and link de-identified administrative data to the survey data (from the original Army STARRS data collection as well as STARRS LS surveys). These data will also be made available in the Research Data Enclave.																													
SRO Project Period	02/2015 - 11/2019																													
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 11/2019																													
Security Plan	NA																													
Milestone Dates	<table><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</td><td>02/01/2015</td><td>Pretest Start:</td><td colspan="2">10/14/2015</td></tr><tr><td>Pretest End:</td><td>03/31/2016</td><td>Recruitment Start:</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr><tr><td>Staffing Completed:</td><td></td><td>GIT Start:</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr><tr><td>SS Train Start:</td><td></td><td>SS Train End:</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr><tr><td>DC Start:</td><td>09/12/2016</td><td>DC End:</td><td colspan="2">09/30/2019</td></tr></table>					PreProduction Start:	02/01/2015	Pretest Start:	10/14/2015		Pretest End:	03/31/2016	Recruitment Start:			Staffing Completed:		GIT Start:			SS Train Start:		SS Train End:			DC Start:	09/12/2016	DC End:	09/30/2019	
PreProduction Start:	02/01/2015	Pretest Start:	10/14/2015																											
Pretest End:	03/31/2016	Recruitment Start:																												
Staffing Completed:		GIT Start:																												
SS Train Start:		SS Train End:																												
DC Start:	09/12/2016	DC End:	09/30/2019																											
Other Project Team Members:	Andrew Hupp, Heather Schroeder, Leah Roberts, Ryan Yoder, Andrew Piskowrowski, Lisa Lewandowski-Romps, Lamont Manley, Emily Blaczyk, Genise Pattulo, Derek Dubuque, Keith Liebetreu																													
Other Project Names:																														
Sample Mgmt Sys	MSMS																													
Data Col Tool	Blaise 5																													
Hardware	Desktop																													
DE Software	N/A																													
QC Recording Tool	Live monitoring																													
Incentive	Yes, R																													
Administration	SRO Group																													
Payment Type	Check, post (\$50-\$100); Cash, prepaid (\$2 (or Challenge coin)); Other (Army STARRS challenge coin (provide																													
Payment Method	Check through other system (MSMS); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (MSMS); Other (Army STA																													

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (A-STARRS LS)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	<p>Activities for December 2016 include:</p> <p>Project Management and Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 worked with Harvard University to review results from the first three months of data collection and update the cost and response rate assumptions used in the initial contact protocol.
- We prepared a response to an NIH RFI that sought information on studies of suicide and the availability of data from these studies.
- James Wagner attended the December 15th Government Steering Committee meeting and presented data collection results to date.
- We prepared the Year 2 annual report and submitted it to HJF.

Enclave and User Support:

- Members of the Enclave IT team continued to work on the remaining list of outstanding items on the security checklist.
- Background check and Flux user access requests have been processed throughout the month.
- Annual training renewal updates were tracked. A few users experienced technical problems with the DoD programs, and UM staff provided assistance.
- The enclave team continues to answer user questions and process data transfer requests as needed; and continues to receive, track and process requests for new software and license renewals as needed.
- We continue to support the analysis teams using the Army STARRS data.
- We are planning to load the first batch of STARRS-LS survey data into the Enclave in February 2017.
- 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 December 22, the production statistics are as follows:
 - o Replicates released: 1-7, with a total of 12,258 sample lines.
 - o Completed Web interviews: 2,474
 - o Completed CATI interviews: 388
 - o Completed End Game interviews: 23 (19 Web, 4 IVR)
- We made a few adjustments to our calling protocol to take into account the University of Michigan closure days in December and January.
 - o We will make telephone calls through December 23. UM is closed December 24-January 2; but we will be calling respondents December 27-30 to keep production moving forward on Replicates 5-7.
 - o The web survey will be kept open, and the timing of email reminders and text messages will be adjusted to avoid sending on a holiday. We will conduct daily safety plan checks and make follow-up calls (Army and UM clinicians) through the holiday period as well.
- 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 in Phases 3 and 4. This is being done to keep our data collection costs within budget.
- We provided Harvard with detailed cost and response rate information the end of November and made the following adjustments for sample Replicates 6, 7 and 8 in December:
 - o Continue 50% subsample of remaining cases after Phase 2
 - o All (remaining) Phase 3 cases offered \$50 and get telephone calls
 - o Phase 4 cases divided into four groups, randomized to letter/no letter and phone calls/no phone calls.
 - o Adjusted calling periods for Replicates 6 and 7 to accommodate UM closure days over the December-January holiday period.
 - o Rescheduled the release of Replicate 8 to January 9, to allow the team to focus on Replicates 6 and 7 late December and early January.
- We continue to evaluate and report on the results from replicates as they move through the contact protocol.
- As of December 22, the Michigan team has followed up on a total of 159 respondents needing a safety plan check.
- Table 1 below shows response rate by phase as of December 22.

Table 1: Response Rate by Replicate and Phase, as of 22 December 2016

Goals	Rep 1*	Rep 2*	Rep 3*	Rep 4*	Rep 5	Rep 6	Rep 7		
Replicate Launch Date			12-Sep	26-Sep	10-Oct	24-Oct	7-Nov	21-Nov	5-Dec
Sample Size	1,006	1,000	1,000	2,313	2,313	2,313	2,313		
Total Interviews		396	342	334	568	597	420	228	
Cumulative Wtd Resp Rate				44.8%*	39.2%*	33.4%*	33.7%*	33.8%	20.1% 9.9%
Phase 1 (letter, coin)	2%	2.9%*	2.6%*	1.7%*	2.0%*	1.6%*	1.6%*	0.9%*	
Phase 2 (email, text msg)		12%	13.8%*	12.6%*	13.3%*	13.8%*	16.3%*	15.0%*	9.0%
Phase 3a (\$100, no calls)		15%	11.6%*	13.2%*	12.7%*	10.5%*	11.8%*	N/A	
Phase 3b (\$50, calls)		15%	16.2%*	15.2%*	13.6%*	13.7%*	13.3%*	4.3%	
Phase 3c (\$100, calls)		25%	23.5%*	17.1%*	18.9%*	21.7%*	21.4%*	N/A	
Phase 4a (\$100, calls)		15%	18.9%*	13.1%*	14.6%*	11.7%*	8.8%		
Phase 4b (\$100, no calls)		15%	9.5%*	7.0%*	5.6%*	6.3%*	1.9%		

Phase 4c (\$100, no calls) 0% 2.7%* 2.6%* 3.5%* 3.7%* 4.4%
 Phase 5 15% 10.7%* 7.9%*

*Phase/Replicate 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 \$327,187 in November 2016 on data collection, interviewer training, production support, project management, and enclave support. We are currently projecting a deficit of \$553,188 for the total project (4.3% of the total budget), increasing our projected total cost by \$350,005 from last month's report. The increase is due to an increase in the projected cost to complete for data collection and pre-post production; and is offset by a decrease in enclave costs. We revised our cost projections to reflect the current contact protocol that has been put in place for Replicates 6 and 7. We will continue to evaluate the results of the sample releases currently being worked and will work with Harvard to refine our sample design and contact protocols to bring our total costs for the five-year project period within the total available budget. We also are still experiencing some issues with our technical systems which are resulting in higher than expected costs for data managers and the project team. We will continue to work on these and try to bring those costs down as quickly as possible.

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 November 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 Oct 2016	\$868,754	\$318,819	\$404,001	\$434,025	\$2,025,599
Actual costs for Nov 2016	\$62,021	\$196,846	\$32,498	\$35,822	\$327,187
Total Year 2 Cost	\$930,775	\$515,665	\$436,499	\$469,847	\$2,352,786
Variance	(\$356,652)	\$1,461,301	\$26,429	\$149,001	\$1,280,079
Year 3 Budget	\$400,008	\$1,981,395	\$476,249	\$603,408	\$3,461,060
Year 3 Projected Total Cost	\$564,732	\$2,602,009	\$503,552	\$621,644	\$4,291,936
Variance	(\$164,724)	(\$620,614)	(\$27,303)	(\$18,236)	(\$830,876)
Year 4 Budget	\$280,594	\$1,055,329	\$410,278	\$654,463	\$2,400,664
Year 4 Projected Total Cost	\$343,653	\$1,501,822	\$432,624	\$663,723	\$2,941,822
Variance	(\$63,059)	(\$446,493)	(\$22,346)	(\$9,260)	(\$541,158)
Year 5 Budget	\$263,619	\$805,264	\$418,806	\$636,637	\$2,124,326
Year 5 Projected Total Cost	\$326,931	\$1,241,578	\$437,997	\$636,461	\$2,642,967
Variance	(\$63,312)	(\$436,314)	(\$19,191)	\$176	(\$518,641)
Total Budget	\$2,088,910	\$5,874,656	\$2,015,689	\$2,758,978	\$12,738,233
Total Projected Cost at Completion	\$2,669,958	\$5,879,863	\$2,106,310	\$2,615,290	\$13,271,421
Total Variance	(\$581,048)	(\$5,207)	(\$90,621)	\$143,688	(\$533,188)

*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.
 - o We worked with Harvard to evaluate the Phase 3-4 experiments and added new Phase 4 experiments. We will continue to 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.
- 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.
 - o The request for approval for the ODUSA contractors to submit Social Security Number (SSN) 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).
 - o We are working on additional analysis to evaluate the quality of the contact information received from various sources.
- 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 It has taken more time than anticipated to modify the systems for the holiday schedule adjustments and new Phase 4 experiments.
- Costs
 - o We have updated our cost projections with the assumption that the current design (subselecting at 50% for Phase 3, making telephone calls to all Phase 3 cases; no further subselection at Phase 4 and making telephone calls to 50% Phase 4 sample) will be used for the remainder of Wave 1 data collection. This has increased our projected data collection costs. We will work with Harvard to adjust the contact protocol as needed to ensure that we stay within budget. Cost projections will be updated as we continue to adjust the study design and scope.
 - o The scope for Wave 2 data collection has not been finalized. We have a place holder for Wave 2 costs and will need to re-evaluate those assumptions as we finalize the scope and cost estimates for the remainder of Wave 1 data collection.
 - o Our pre-post data collection costs have increased slightly, primarily due to the complexity of the sample design, along with the learning curve and development still underway with our sample management system. We are working with the developers to prioritize and focus on developing new features that will have the biggest impact on reducing project management and data management staff time, and increasing interviewer efficiency.

Cost

Dec 19, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 3,394,696.00

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 13,271,421.00

Total Budget: 12,738,233.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -533,188.00

Reason For Variance:

We adjusted the data collection scope assumptions to reflect our current contact protocol for Wave 1. We continue to experience problems with MSMS and delays in the roll out of features that will help improve efficiency. 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

Dec 19, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 357,667.00

Actual Dollars Used: 327,187.00

Variance (Projected minus Actual): 30,480.00

Reason For Variance:

Most of the under-run was due to not using respondent payments as quickly as we anticipated, and a few other nonsalary categories that had 'place holder' amounts for Year 2. Since Year 2 ended November 30, we did not move those place holder amounts forward to future months.

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

Other Measures

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

Project Name	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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>					
SRO Project Period	04/2016 - 02/2017					
Data Col Period	07/2016 - 03/2017					
Security Plan	NA					
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: 04/01/2016 Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 10/17/2016 DC Start: 10/03/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: 07/01/2016 GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>				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:
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:	Joe Matuzak - Project Manager; Dan Zahs - Sampling; Sue Hodge - SSA; Kirsten Alcser - SPA; Paul Schultz - programmer; Brad Goodwin - data manager; J. Smith - Surveytrak programmer.					

Other Project**Names:**

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

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (DMACS)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

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

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

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

Task 2: Sampling

- Subsampling for Wave 1 defined and completed. Interviewer maps created.

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Drafting of Wave 2 support materials completed.
- Wave 2 Spanish translation completed and reviewed.
- Discovered - and assessed impact of - errors in the Wave 1 PAPI questionnaire; worked with project staff to determine options for collecting missing data (decision: re-ask questions in Wave 2 data collection).
- Corrected the Wave 1 PAPI instrument and printed a small number of them for distribution during the upcoming face-to-face component of the project.

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Revision of Wave 2 Illume questionnaire begun.

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Wave 1 subsampling cases flagged, sorted into clusters, assigned
- Sample assignment for FTF activities defined.

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

- Weekly Interviewer meetings conducted

Task 8: Main Data Collection

- Wave 1 web data collection continued
- Wave 1 Interviewer reminder calls completed
- Wave 1 subsampling maps and PAPI sent to interviewers; FTF activities begun
- Respondent Incentive payments processed on a weekly basis.
- Ongoing tracking of missing respondent payment information.
- Data entry of returned PAPIs continued
- Data collection continued with good results: 310 completed web surveys, and 299 PAPI interviews completed by end of year, which puts us at 86% of goal. 269 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 12/13/2016	\$	125,542
Expected cost at complete	\$	276,325
Expected Variance:	\$	(19,563)

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

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

The cost estimate projects an overrun, principally due to inadvertent under-budgeting of interviewer hours and other expenses at the proposal stage. SRO and SRC reviewed and approved an estimated overrun up to \$17,000. The currently projected overrun is slightly higher (\$19,563). 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. Because it is a feasibility study, protocol prescriptions (and budgeted costs) may negatively affect the overall (traditional) response rate for the study. For example, interviewers are instructed to conduct reminder calls only and try to push respondents to complete the Self Administered Questionnaire (web of PAPI), rather than try to have the R do the interview while the respondent is already on the phone.
- The project continues to run behind schedule, primarily due to extended discussions around the final questionnaire versions. The errors discovered in the Wave 1 PAPI have added to the delay in finalizing the Wave 2 instruments, as we worked through the best options for collecting the missing data from Wave 1 – by adding the Wave 1 questions to the Wave 2 questionnaire. The timing of the work to finalize the Wave 2 questionnaire ended up being too close to the holiday break to allow for thorough testing and launch. And, the changes had to be approved by IRB as well. With the planned delay in launch of Wave 2 data collection, we will need to extend that round of data collection by approximately four to six weeks.
- It appears that budgeted estimates for interviewer travel costs were high and we anticipate that unspent funds for travel may offset additional management and programming costs associated with extending the timeline.

Cost Dec 13, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	125,541.55
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	276,332.22
Total Budget:	256,769.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-19,563.22
Reason For Variance:	The cost estimate projects an overrun, due to inadvertent under-budgeting of interviewer hours and other expenses. This overrun has been reviewed by SRC, and will continue to be carefully monitored as the project progresses. The expected overrun was estimated to be \$17,000.

Projections Dec 13, 2016

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

Measures

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

Other Measures

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

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (HCAP 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	As of January 3, we completed 1871 Respondent and 1614 Informant interviews. The current sample is 2988 Respondent and 2988 Informant cases. The next sample release will be done January 10, 2017 and is estimated to be approximately 900 cases.		

Special Issues

Most HCAP interviewers are shared with HRS, but starting in February approximately 27 will be shared with PSID. In order to fill the gap in hours that may be created by sharing resources we are planning a third interviewer training. Currently it's planned for early March.

Cost
Jan 31, 2017

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	2,580,584.22
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	5,027,056.34
Total Budget:	4,476,719.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-550,334.34
Reason For Variance:	Several workscope changes have been implemented including additional cognitive tests for the Respondent interview, length of interviewer training, interviewer retention bonus, project management staff hours, and respondent incentives.
	In addition, actual interviewer rates are higher than the rates used on the budget. All interviewers working on the project are on-staff.

Projections
Jan 31, 2017

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

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Health and Retirement Study (HRS 2016)													
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed Total of Modes: 2													
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget:	24,690,534.00	Indirect Budget:	8,888,593.00 Total Budget: 33,579,127.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (SRC) Mary Beth Ofstedal (SRC) Ken Langa (SRC)													
Funding Agency	NIA													
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00061128	Period Of Approval:	1/15/2015 - 1/14/201										
Project Team	Project Lead:	Nicole G Kirgis												
	Budget Analyst:	Richard Warren Krause												
	Production Manager:	Stephanie Sullivan												
	Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher												
	Production Manager:	Jennifer C Arrieta												
	Production Manager:	Piotr Dworak												
Proposal #:	no data													
Description:	<p>The Health and Retirement Study (HRS) is a national, longitudinal study conducted every two years since 1992. The study includes a representative sample of US residents aged 50 years and older. Every six years (three waves) a new cohort of US residents aged 50 to 55 are screened in to the study to maintain representativeness. In 2004, the early baby boomers were screened in and completed a baseline interview. In 2010, the mid baby boomer cohort was added as well as a minority oversample of both early and mid-baby boomers. In 2016, the late baby boomer cohort will be added. A series of physical measures and biomarkers are collected with half of all living respondents each wave as well as a self-administered questionnaire. Additionally, permission to link to Social Security Administration records and Veterans Administration (VA) records is requested.</p>													
SRO Project Period	04/2015 - 06/2017													
Data Col Period	02/2016 - 04/2017													
Security Plan	NA													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 04/01/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start: 10/16/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End: 11/07/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 06/01/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 03/15/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 02/10/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 02/12/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 04/24/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 02/22/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End: 04/29/2017</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: 04/01/2015	Pretest Start: 10/16/2015	Pretest End: 11/07/2015	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2015	Staffing Completed: 03/15/2016	GIT Start: 02/10/2016	SS Train Start: 02/12/2016	SS Train End: 04/24/2016	DC Start: 02/22/2016	DC End: 04/29/2017
PreProduction Start: 04/01/2015	Pretest Start: 10/16/2015													
Pretest End: 11/07/2015	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2015													
Staffing Completed: 03/15/2016	GIT Start: 02/10/2016													
SS Train Start: 02/12/2016	SS Train End: 04/24/2016													
DC Start: 02/22/2016	DC End: 04/29/2017													
Other Project Team Members:	Rebecca Gatward (Survey Director), Sharon Parker (Production Management Coordinator), Frost Hubbard (New Cohort), Jennifer Kelley (Respondent Contact Coordinator), Jaime Koopman (Project Manager), Russ Stark (SSL Production Manager), Ian Ogden (Project Assistant), Dan Tomlin (Project Assistant), Lisa deRamos (Project Assistant), Daniah Buageila (Project Assistant)													
Other Project Names:														
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak; MSMS													
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8													
Hardware	Laptop													
DE Software	NA													
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CXM													
Incentive	Yes, R													
Administration	SRO Group													
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (80.00)													
Payment Method	Check through STrak RPay System													

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (HRS 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	<p>During the month of December, 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 early May 2017 with a panel response rate of 85%. Current projections take New Cohort production into November 2017. Training an additional group of New Cohort interviewers is expected in March 2017.</p>		

Technical Development: Further development in production systems continues (including WebTrak and WebLog). A new data model was released to the field to correct a fill issue in the Spanish instrument.

Special Issues

Cost
Nov 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 24,092,972.15
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 33,627,374.22
Total Budget: 33,579,127.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -48,247.22
Reason For Variance:

Projection refinements are ongoing. Projection adjustments are in progress for interviewer hours to extend New Cohort into fall and add a training of New Cohort interviewers in March 2017.

Projections
Nov 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 1,869,415.54
Actual Dollars Used: 1,503,426.44
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 365,989.10
Reason For Variance:

Actual dollars for the month of November came in under projections due to (1) Salaries were under by 12%, mostly due to iwer hours which are being revised (2) Respondent payments were under projections (3) We removed about 9,600 screener hours that will be covered by PSID.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	23,352	85%	7.45
Goal at Completion:	23,352	85	7.45
Current actual:	15,730	58%	7.1
Estimate at Complete:	23,352	85	7.45
Variance:			

Other Measures

Goal for New Cohort is 5,228 interviews.
 Goal for Panel lws is 18,124 interviews (85%).

Project Name	Housing & Children (HCDC, H&C)			
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1			
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current
Budget	Direct Budget:	8,774,925.00	Indirect Budget:	1,968,094.00
			Total Budget:	10,743,019.00

Principal Investigator/Client

Funding Agency

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

Project Team

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

Proposal #: no data

Description:

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

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

SRO Project Period 04/2016 - 02/2020

Data Col Period 05/2017 - 05/2018

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

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

Other Project

Team Members:

Other Project**Names:****Sample Mgmt Sys****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 <\$5, Finders fee \$10, child

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

Report Period

Dec, 2016 (HCDC, H&C)

Project Phase

Implementing

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

During December 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.
- Monitored Pilot production including generating tailored reports for biweekly meetings, and as deliverables to the project team.
- Prepared invoices and invoice documentation. Updated invoice receivables schedule.
- Reviewed/monitored spending compared to budget. Revised monthly projections. Delivered report on estimated annual spending.
- Conducted debriefing on Pilot production.
- Revised use-cases for testing screening assumptions. Conducted special meeting to discuss use cases in order to elaborate Voucher Applicant sample screening protocol.
- Reviewed reported data collection issues for severity and importance, and where necessary directed instrument and data collection protocol modifications.
- Contacted several saliva analysis experts at UM to investigate alternatives to blood spot collection with children. Set up and conducted a meeting to discuss saliva as a replacement for measuring blood lead levels.
- Reviewed/prepared data files for delivery, updated delivery documentation.
 - o Compared data to specifications
 - o Checked distributions of some variables

Task 2: Sampling

% Task Spent to Date

- Monitored performance of Pilot sample.
- Selected and released an additional 144 sample lines.

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

% Task Spent to Date

- Pilot Production
 - o Held weekly meetings with Interviewers and Team Leaders
 - o Logging
 - ☐ Logged incoming SAQs, Child Time Diaries
 - 19 HH SAQs
 - 24 Child-specific SAQs
 - 4 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 12/31/2016
 - ☐ Screening Production
 - 828 sample households with attempted contact
 - 99 eligible households identified, 240 non-interviews
 - 234 ineligible households identified, 255 non-sample addresses
 - 50 completed PCG interviews, 66 completed Child interviews
 - ☐ Reminder calls – produced coversheets and conducted reminder calls for Child Time Diary completion
 - o Interviewing Systems Maintenance and Development, Preparation for Main Production
 - o Child Interview
 - ☐ Updated specifications for new blood collection language.
 - ☐ Reviewed data to triage laptop performance issues for one interviewer (sticking “A” key impacted collection of Hearts & Flowers data).
 - o Adult CAPI Questionnaire

☐ Completed documentation of programming for PCG Interview – updated specifications to reflect all programmed instructions.

- o Laser Tape Measurement
- ☐ Updated specification to include more descriptive variable names.
- o Screening Questionnaire
- ☐ Developed additional testing scenarios and use cases.
- o Contact Observations

Updated specification.

Task 4: CAI Programming

% Task Spent to Date

- Child
- o Updated, tested, and released new language for Child dried blood spots.
- o Tested Inquisite version of Hearts & Flowers (H&F) offline. Set up independent “project” to test integrated version of Inquisite Hearts & Flowers. Began to program integration of Inquisite H&F.
- PCG
- o Reviewed programming for vignettes.
- Post Interview Observations
- Contact Observations
- o Programmed, tested and released updates to contact observations.
- Data Entry Applications
- o Updated data entry applications for SAQs, Child Time Diary

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.
- Continued programming of logging applications

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

% Task Spent to Date

- Evaluated RFQs from vendors for May 2017 training sites. Made final selections for study-specific 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

- Prepared and delivered pilot data files

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: The lancet initially selected for child dried blood spots did not producing sufficient sample for analysis. Two additional lancets were piloted in the field. While results with one of the new lancets were better, we still may not be collecting enough blood to conduct all of the assays desired. Use of the new lancets and new assent language appears to have improved child assent rates for blood collection
- The questionnaires, especially the adult questionnaire in conjunction with the laser tape measurements, were significantly longer than budgeted. We estimate that about 13 minutes must be cut from the interview length to bring it back into line with budgeted estimates. This appears to have had a negative impact on our ability to complete multiple household interviews in a day, and according to interview reports sometimes negatively impacted the willingness of children to participate.
- 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 Hearts and Flowers program:
- 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
Dec 12, 2016**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	1,027,411.58
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	9,134,412.00
Total Budget:	10,743,019.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

**Projections
Dec 12, 2016**

Dollars Projected For Month:	243,122.00
Actual Dollars Used:	224,703.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	18,418.00
Reason For Variance:	Invoices for study-specific training had not yet been received and paid.

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study (MTTS)

Project Mode Primary: Mail Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 2

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

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

Funding Agency

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

SRO Project Period 09/2014 - 06/2016

Data Col Period 01/2015 - 12/2015

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 10/01/2014

Pretest End:

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start:

DC Start: 03/02/2015

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start: 01/26/2015

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

DC End: 05/31/2016

Other Project

Team Members:

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

Other Project**Names:**

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

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (MTTS)	Project Phase	Closing
Risk Level	<i>On Track</i>		
Monthly Update	No significant SRO activity in December, other than standard reporting. All activity was in EWB.		

Special Issues

Cost	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	933,197.61
Jan 31, 2017	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,016,078.00
	Total Budget:	1,019,417.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	60,338.00
	Reason For Variance:	A deobligation of \$57,000 in total cost is pending

Projections	Dollars Projected For Month:	14,464.00
Jan 31, 2017	Actual Dollars Used:	8,587.00
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	5,877.00
	Reason For Variance:	Closing activity was deferred pending information from Harvard.

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

Other Measures

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

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

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

Principal Investigator/Client Megan Patrick (UM-SRC)

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

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SRO Project Period 08/2012 - 08/2017

Data Col Period 04/2016 - 08/2016

Security Plan Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:
Pretest 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

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

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

Risk Level	<i>Not Rated</i>
-------------------	------------------

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

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

Cost		
Nov 30, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	289,892.72
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	424,123.96
	Total Budget:	435,158.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	11,034.04
	Reason For Variance:	
Projections		
Nov 30, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	22,070.46
	Actual Dollars Used:	16,438.23
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	5,632.23
	Reason For Variance:	

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

Other Measures

Project Name	MTF Base Year Tablet Pilot (MTF Tablet Pilot)												
Project Mode	Primary: Class SAQ Total of Modes: 1												
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget: 461,821.00	Indirect Budget: 254,002.00	Total Budget: 715,823.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Richard Miech (UM-SRC)												
Funding Agency	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). Fall 2015-only budget, direct: \$67,163.00; Indir:\$36,940.00; Total:\$104,103.00												
IRB	HUM#: HUM00112493	Period Of Approval:	3/1/2017 - 2/28/2018										
Project Team	Project Lead: Meredith A House Budget Analyst: Christine Evanchek Production Manager: Barbara Aghababian-Homburg Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul Production Manager: Production Manager:												
Proposal #:	no data												
Description:	The fall 2015 and spring 2016 tablet pilots will test the feasibility of moving from paper Scantron forms to a tablet-based application for the administration of MTF Base Year data collection. Two forms of 8th/10th grade MTF survey and two forms of the 12th grade MTF survey will be administered in two schools in the fall pilot and in eight schools in the spring pilot.												
SRO Project Period	06/2015 - 08/2017												
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 05/2017												
Security Plan	Yes												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 02/16/2017</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: 03/30/2017</td> <td>SS Train End: 04/06/2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 04/04/2017</td> <td>DC End: 05/23/2017</td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: 02/16/2017	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start: 03/30/2017	SS Train End: 04/06/2017	DC Start: 04/04/2017	DC End: 05/23/2017
PreProduction Start: 02/16/2017	Pretest Start:												
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:												
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:												
SS Train Start: 03/30/2017	SS Train End: 04/06/2017												
DC Start: 04/04/2017	DC End: 05/23/2017												
Other Project Team Members:	David Bolt (Technical Systems/Help desk), Lawrence Daher (Technical Systems/Help desk), Minako Edgar (Data Manager), Kyle Kwaiser (Technical Systems Lead/Data Manager), Paul Schulz (Survey Programmer), Marsha Skoman (App programmer), Pam Swanson (Survey Programmer), Daric Thorne (SSA). Note: Mike Nugent (SSL) is the field researcher for fall 2015. 2016-2017, MTF field staff will serve as FRs.												
Other Project Names:	MTF Fall 2015 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 2016 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 2017 Tablet Pilot												
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak												
Data Col Tool	Other (SurveyCTO; custom)												
Hardware	Laptop; Tablet												
DE Software	Other (Google Form)												
QC Recording Tool	N/A												
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (Schools)												
Administration	SRO Group												
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (\$1,000 (fall 2015 schools only)); Check, post (\$500 or \$1000 (2016-2017 schools)); Cash, post												
Payment Method	Check through other system (Rpay spreadsheet); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (Rpay spreadsh												

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (MTF Tablet Pilot)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	<p>In December: The final fall 2016 administration took place Dec. 2 and debriefing with the FRs was held Dec. 4. The team is working on the fall 2016 data deliverables and documentation for a January delivery.</p> <p>Marsha and Pam have joined the team as resources for the additional form programming and app development for spring 2017. We held a few project and task orientation meetings with them.</p> <p>We are shifting to spring 2017 major areas of development:</p>		

- 1 Training (streamlined/video for helpers)
- 2 Survey Wrapper App
- 2a Revisit SHApp Encrypt. Preload (incorporate into Wrapper App?)
- 3 Shapp WiFi improvements
- 4 Explore MDM options
- 5 Inventory and shipping logistics (Pull from Strak-for scheduling)
- 6 Additional Form programming

Additionally, we are investigating new Samsung tablet models and will choose one for the purchase of 740 more tablets (for a total of 1,040).

Spring 2017 IRB amendment was submitted 12/22 for all changes except survey content updates.

Special Issues

Cost Dec 31, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	467,224.27
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	970,325.85
	Total Budget:	715,823.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-254,502.85
	Reason For Variance:	Projections now include SO#14-0047R01S2 (Additional form programming), the spring 2017 pilot work through 4/30/2017, AND the purchase of an additional 760 tablets (see 01/17 update).
Projections Dec 31, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	7,966.57
	Actual Dollars Used:	8,559.90
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-593.33
	Reason For Variance:	

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG 2010-2020)													
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1													
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget:	32,653,126.47	Indirect Budget:	8,448,262.00 Total Budget: 41,101,388.47										
Principal Investigator/Client	Joyce Abma (NCHS) Mick Couper (ISR)													
Funding Agency	NCHS, CDC, NICHD													
IRB	HUM#:	0002716	Period Of Approval:	7/17/13 - 7/17/17										
Project Team	Project Lead:	Heidi Marie Guyer												
	Budget Analyst:	Nancy Oeffner												
	Production Manager:	Theresa Camelo												
	Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher												
	Production Manager:	Maureen Joan O'Brien												
	Production Manager:	Rebecca Loomis												
Proposal #:	no data													
Description:	The NSFG is a national survey of women and men 15-49 years of age designed to provide national estimates of factors affecting pregnancy and birth rates, including sexual activity, cohabitation, marriage, divorce, contraceptive use, miscarriage and stillbirth, infertility, and use of medical services for family planning and infertility. NSFG 2010-2020 includes eight years of continuous data collection starting in September 2011 and ending in 2019. Every year, new PSUs will be selected to replace last year's non-self representing PSUs and self-representing PSUs, and the project will continue to collect data from a set of major self representing PSUs throughout the entire data collection period. Target number of interviews is approximately 5000 per year.													
SRO Project Period	09/2010 - 07/2020													
Data Col Period	09/2011 - 06/2019													
Security Plan	Yes													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011</td> <td>GIT Start: 09/13/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start: 09/15/2011</td> <td>SS Train End: 09/19/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 09/20/2011</td> <td>DC End: 07/01/2019</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011	Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011	GIT Start: 09/13/2011	SS Train Start: 09/15/2011	SS Train End: 09/19/2011	DC Start: 09/20/2011	DC End: 07/01/2019
PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011	Pretest Start:													
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011													
Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011	GIT Start: 09/13/2011													
SS Train Start: 09/15/2011	SS Train End: 09/19/2011													
DC Start: 09/20/2011	DC End: 07/01/2019													
Other Project Team Members:	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst													
Other Project Names:														
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak													
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8													
Hardware	Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil													
DE Software	NA													
QC Recording Tool	N/A													
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (babysitting fee)													
Administration	SRO Group													
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid (\$5; \$40); Cash, post (\$40; \$60)													
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office													

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (NSFG 2010-2020)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

Monthly Update	<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 17 interviewers. This will be the largest attrition training to date. The high rate of attrition affected interview yield in quarter 21 as the eligibility rate was the highest it's been thus far and sufficient staff were not available to complete the full potential of interviews. While the yield exceeded 1300, the response rates are below 70%, which is quite undesirable. The yield will likely be lower next quarter as the new interviewers will not begin until week 4 or 5 of the quarter and the winter months can be particularly challenging. The current quarter was extended by 4 days and continued through Wednesday, December 21st rather than ending on</p>
-----------------------	---

Saturday, December 17th as originally planned. The extension resulted in 22 additional interviews and the total number of completed interviews exceeding 1300. NCHS received proposed questionnaire changes from the various funding agencies in mid-October. Updated 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. Two amendments were submitted to the NCHS ERB at the end of the month-- one for a paper screener experiment and a second with updated language for all respondent letters and brochures regarding cybersecurity.

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
Dec 07, 2016**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 27,184,958.82
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 43,368,612.37
Total Budget: 41,101,388.47
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -2,267,223.90
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
Dec 07, 2016**

Dollars Projected For Month: 437,567.82
Actual Dollars Used: 393,051.61
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 44,516.21
Reason For Variance:

Several large expenses that we were expecting to incur did not come in. This includes the September training costs, ACA benefits and several other non-salary items.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1250	70%	9.0
Goal at Completion:	1350	75%	9.0
Current actual:	1320	66%	10.2
Estimate at Complete:	1320	66%	10.2
Variance:	30	9%	1.2

Other Measures

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

Project Name	Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior (AHRB)				
Project Mode	Primary: Class SAQ	Secondary: Web	Total of Modes: 2		
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 919,405.00	Indirect Budget: 507,595.00	Total Budget: 1,427,000.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Daniel Keating (U-M SRC)				
Funding Agency	Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of-National Institutes of Health				
IRB	HUM#: HUM00084650	Period Of Approval:	2/3/2016 - 2/2/2017		
Project Team	Project Lead: Peter Rakesh Batra Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens Production Manager: Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul Production Manager: Meredith A House Production Manager:				
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>During early adolescence systems in the brain that are characterized by heightened reactivity to motivational stimuli and rewards mature rapidly, while systems that enable more effective cognitive control and judgment mature more slowly. This "developmental maturity mismatch" has been proposed as a key contributor to health risk behavior among adolescents, which is of critical importance because: (1) risk behaviors are the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in this age group, including diseases arising from unprotected sexual activity and casualties arising from reckless behavior (including driving fatalities and serious injuries); (2) it is the peak age for the onset of a wide range of risk behavior patterns with potential long-term consequences, including substance use and abuse, and delinquency. The "developmental maturity mismatch" hypothesis, however, has not been directly tested in relation to risk behavior at a level sufficient to inform this critical health area. The primary aim of the ANDH study is to understand the behavioral, cognitive, and neural bases of risk taking, through integrated analyses of age differences, developmental trajectories, and individual differences in psychosocial, neurocognitive and neural imaging assessments.</p> <p>The study will involve data collection from 10th and 12th grade students (~2000 students total) in 7-8 local high schools (approximately 150 students from each age group per school), with group administration in the schools using laptops in a baseline data collection to be completed over a 3-month period in the fall of 2014. Each respondent will attend 2 ~45 minute sessions: one survey and one neurocognitive tests. After the baseline data collection, SRO will modify the survey questionnaire to operate as a web-based survey, and will administer the web survey to all 2,000 respondents in years 2, 3, and 4 of the project (in the fall of 2015, 2016 and 2017). A small number of respondents (150-160) will be sub-selected to undergo neural imaging at U-M facilities in Ann Arbor (SRO will not be directly involved in this portion of the study).</p>				
SRO Project Period	04/2014 - 03/2018				
Data Col Period	03/2015 - 01/2016				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: 01/03/2017 Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: 12/21/2016 Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018 </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: 01/03/2017 Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016	Pretest Start: 12/21/2016 Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: 01/03/2017 Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016	Pretest Start: 12/21/2016 Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018				
Other Project Team Members:	<p>Wave 2 Team: Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Kathy LaDronka, Becky Loomis, Dolorence Okullo (data management), Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun</p> <p>Wave 1 Team: Larry Daher, Emmanuel Ellis, David Bolt, Kyle Goodman, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Becky Loomis, Max Malhotra, Shaowei Sun, Laura Yoder (data management)</p>				

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

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (AHRB)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

Monthly Update	This month saw the culmination of several months of work (e.g. programming, testing, etc) come together. Both Peter and Meredith focused solely on moving the project forward. We started the month with a productive PI meeting laying the groundwork for planning a production launch in mid January.
-----------------------	---

The IRB amendment for Wave 2 included revised respondent letters, changes to the survey instrument, and other procedural modifications and was approved (without changes requested!) by IRB. Additionally, the testing of our entire system and procedures--from the emailer and portal to the updating of respondent contact info (SRIS) and neurocognitive tasks went very well and was completed on-time. This was despite a last -minute change to our neurocognitive task procedures, initiated by the PI, our technical team (led by Kyle and Heuichun) was able to efficiently and effectively implement and test the changes in a very short time. Since this was above and beyond what was agreed to, the PI approved a budget increase for this extra work.

We have also launched a pre-test (n=18) using primarily UM grad students associated with the PI's research team to confirm our assumptions of system performance, estimated survey and task completion lengths and general feedback prior to our production launch. We have now started with printing of final survey materials, including the brochure, and are on track to launch our survey in mid January 2017.

Special Issues

Cost	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	1,066,616.56
Dec 31, 2016	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,454,905.94
	Total Budget:	1,427,000.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	388,289.38
	Reason For Variance:	The projections do not include the smoothing agreement that Dean will reconcile in the budget in Jan 2017

Projections	Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Dec 31, 2016	Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
	Reason For Variance:	

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

Other Measures

Project Name Optimizing Youth Suicide Risk Screening and Triage In the Emergency Department (YRS)

Project Mode Primary: Telephone Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

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

Funding Agency

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

SRO Project Period 03/2015 - 12/2017

Data Col Period 07/2015 - 07/2017

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

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

Other Project

Team Members:

Other Project

Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys SMS

Data Col Tool NA

Hardware Desktop

DE Software NA

QC Recording Tool NA

Incentive Yes, Other (Amazon gift card (Project staff))

Administration NA

Payment Type NA

Payment Method NA

Report Period Dec, 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 accounts have been set-up and we are beginning to put projections in CRS

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.

Special Issues

Cost Dec 31, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	836,462.68
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,328,667.77
	Total Budget:	1,979,245.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	16,184.23
	Reason For Variance:	

Projections Dec 31, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	41,994.26
	Actual Dollars Used:	35,872.32
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	6,121.94
	Reason For Variance:	As sample declines less interviewer hours needed, no more 3 month interviews, finishing up the six month interviews.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	3331	85%	3.0
Goal at Completion:	4200	85%	3.0
Current actual:	3580	69%	1.2
Estimate at Complete:		70%	
Variance:			

Other Measures

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

Project Name	PSID Wellbeing (PSID-WB)				
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed Total of Modes: 3				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 455,760.00	Indirect Budget: 250,668.00	Total Budget: 706,428.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Vicki Freedman (UM-SRC)				
Funding Agency	National Institute on Aging				
IRB	HUM#: HUM00109415	Period Of Approval:	1/21/16 - 1/20/17		
Project Team	Project Lead: Rachel Anne LeClere Budget Analyst: William Lokers Production Manager: Derek Dubuque Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul Production Manager: Production Manager:				
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)—Wellbeing and Daily Life Study is part of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics – a national, longitudinal study of families started in 1968. The study is the second Mixed-Mode, Web/Mail study carried out on the PSID Suite. The sample for PSID-Wellbeing and Daily Life Study is comprised of the majority of PSID respondents and spouses and includes approximately 10,784 individuals. Respondents are invited either complete an on-line or on paper. When initially invited to participate, potential respondents were assigned to the Web Group or the Choice Group, based upon analysis done of past data to predict which mode the respondents were most likely to complete. Follow-up efforts have consisted of both hard-copy and e-mailed reminders as well as non-response reminder calling. The interview content includes questions about wellbeing, personality traits, and every day skills and will allow researchers to better understand the wellbeing of America's families and how it is influenced by health, economic status, and family circumstances</p>				
SRO Project Period	10/2015 - 09/2016				
Data Col Period	NA				
Security Plan	NA				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:				
Other Project Team Members:	Rachel LeClere - Project Manager Emily Blasczyk--Data Manager and Report Programmer Hueichun Peng--Custom Project SMS Programmer Donnalee Grey-Farquharson--Custom Project SMS Design/Specifications Max Malhotra--Illume Programmer Alexander Hernandez--Illume Programmer Stefanie Skulsky - Project Assistant Tony Romanowski - Materials and Training Developer				
Other Project Names:	PSID Web/Mail 2016 FES Wellbeing and Daily Life				
Sample Mgmt Sys	Web SMS				
Data Col Tool	Illume; SAQ				
Hardware	Other (R hardware)				
DE Software	Illume				
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CXM				
Incentive	Yes, R				
Administration	ISR Group (SRC-PSID)				
Payment Type	Check, post (\$20); Cash, prepaid (\$5)				
Payment Method	Check through other system (PSID_RAPS)				

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (PSID-WB)	Project Phase	Closing
----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	---------

Risk Level *Not Rated*

Monthly Update Activities for December included:

- Closed web portal
- Finished logging all PAPIs
- Began work to finalize all remaining open cases.

Special Issues

Cost
Nov 30, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	634,067.96
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	666,950.21
<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

Project Name	Social Networks and Well Being (SN&WB)													
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Secondary: Telephone													
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget:	549,753.00	Indirect Budget:	302,365.00 Total Budget: 852,118.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Kira Birdett (University of Michigan) Karen Fingerman (University of Texas at Austin)													
Funding Agency														
IRB	HUM#:	2015-02-0123	Period Of Approval:	4/15/16-4/15/17										
Project Team	Project Lead:	Heidi Marie Guyer												
	Budget Analyst:													
	Production Manager:	Kathleen S Ladronka												
	Senior Project Advisor:	Kirsten Haakan Alcser												
	Production Manager:	Russell W Stark												
	Production Manager:	Esther H Ullman												
Proposal #:	no data													
Description:	<p>SRO will screen and invite 500 adults over 65 years of age residing in Austin, TX to complete an in-person interview and follow up assessments. The primary aims of this study are to examine the effects of members of one's social network versus others encountered in terms of the quality of the relationship as well as physical, emotional and cognitive functions associated with social interactions among adults older than 65 residing in the Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area.</p> <p>The screening interview will be conducted in the Survey Services Lab (SSL). The main interview will be conducted in person in the respondent's home by local field staff. The main interview will collect information on demographic characteristics, social networks, and emotional, cognitive and physical functioning including walking speed and grip strength. At the end of the main interview, the interviewer will instruct the respondent on using an Android device (smartphone) programmed with the Electronically Activated Recorder (EAR) and daily surveys (mobile-ecological momentary assessment: mEMA) as well as a microphone for the recordings and a wrist Actigraph. The interviewer will explain the instructions for each of the three monitoring systems: EAR, mEMA and the Actigraph. Participants will use the 3 devices during a 4-day (intensive) data collection period starting on a Thurs, Fri or Sat to encompass 2 weekend days and 2 weekdays. The interviewer will leave the devices and instructions with the respondent and schedule a time to return to pick them up after the 4-day period. The interviewer will also leave a self-administered paper questionnaire with the respondent. The respondent will be instructed to complete the questionnaire on their own and return it to the University of Texas. The interviewer will also be responsible for daily reminder/troubleshooting calls to the respondent.</p>													
SRO Project Period	01/2016 - 04/2017													
Data Col Period														
Security Plan	NA													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 08/27/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 10/17/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 10/20/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 10/22/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End:</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016	Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016	GIT Start: 08/27/2016	SS Train Start: 10/17/2016	SS Train End: 10/20/2016	DC Start: 10/22/2016	DC End:
PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016	Pretest Start:													
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016													
Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016	GIT Start: 08/27/2016													
SS Train Start: 10/17/2016	SS Train End: 10/20/2016													
DC Start: 10/22/2016	DC End:													
Other Project Team Members:	Karl Dinkelmann, Marsha Skoman, Lisa Quist, Holly Ackerman, Dan Zahs, Paul Burton, Grace Tison, Suzanne Hodge													
Other Project Names:	Daily Experiences and Well-Being (DEWS)													
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak													
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; SAQ; Other (mEMA and EAR app on Android, Actical)													
Hardware	Laptop; Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (Android device, Actical device)													
DE Software	NA													
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Live monitoring													
Incentive	Yes, R													
Administration	NA													
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid (\$1); Cash, post (\$50 + \$100)													
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office													

Report Period	Dec, 2016 (SN&WB)	Project Phase	Initiation																								
Risk Level	Some Concerns																										
Monthly Update	Data collection continues only slightly under goals, but the hope is that goals will be exceeded by the end of the year. PI understands that costs may exceed budget due to additions (SAQ, 5th day of respondent data collection, etc.) She will talk in January about other sources of funding she may have to address these needs.																										
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																											
Dec 31, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	462,982.82																									
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	853,932.63																									
	Total Budget:	852,118.00																									
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-53,021.63																									
	Reason For Variance:	Hours needed for production and length of interview higher than projected. Conversation underway with PI who will review additional funds available for project when we talk Jan 2017.																									
Projections																											
Dec 31, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	149,985.20																									
	Actual Dollars Used:	117,387.94																									
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	32,597.26																									
	Reason For Variance:	Not all costs for training, travel and respondent expenses are showing on the report-																									
Measures	<table><thead><tr><th></th><th>Units Complete</th><th>RR</th><th>HPI</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Current Goal:</td><td>140</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>119</td><td>.42</td><td>11.3</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></tbody></table>				Units Complete	RR	HPI	Current Goal:	140			Goal at Completion:	300		8.8	Current actual:	119	.42	11.3	Estimate at Complete:				Variance:			
	Units Complete	RR	HPI																								
Current Goal:	140																										
Goal at Completion:	300		8.8																								
Current actual:	119	.42	11.3																								
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.																										