Survey Research Operations

Monthly Project Report

Sponsored Projects

April 2015

Sponsored Projects

(Army STARRS) Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers
(A-STARRS LS) Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study
(Biobanks) Donors' Moral Concerns About Biobanks: National Survey and Public Deliberation
(HRS 2014) Health and Retirement Study 2014
(CogVal) HRS Cognitive Diagnosis Validation Study
(HRS Screening Initiatives) HRS Screening Initiatives
(MTTS) Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study
(MILES) MILES Lupus Study
(MTF-WPSP Year 2) Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot
(NSFG 2010-2020) National Survey of Family Growth
(AHRB) Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior
(PSID-CE (aka FES-CE)) Panel Study of Income Dynamics Childhood Experiences Web/Mail Project
(SRS W3) Social Relations, Aging and Health: Competing Theories and Emerging Complexities, Wave 3
(SCIP-2014) Sustainability Cultural Indicators Program-2014
(CDS 2014) Transitions from Preschool through High School: Family, Schools and Neighborhoods

Project Name	Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS)
Project Mode	Primary: Class SAQ Secondary: Mixed Total of Modes: 8
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 25,000,296.00 ***InDirect Budget:*** 6,478,176.00 ***Total Budget:*** 31,478,471.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Steve Heeringa (University of Michigan) James Wagner (University of Michigan)

Funding Agency

IRB	***HUM#:*** Various		***Period Of Approval:*** Various	
Project Team	***Project Lead:***	Nancy J Gebler		
	Budget Analyst:	William Lokers		
	Production Manager:	Ruth B Philippou		
	Senior Project Advisor:	Beth-Ellen Pennell		
	Production Manager:	Margaret Lee Hudson		
	Production Manager:	Andrew L Hupp		

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	The Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Service Members (STARRS) is the largest study of suicide and mental health among military personnel ever undertaken. The purpose of the collaborative study is to identify modifiable risk and protective factors and moderators of suicidal behavior, to help inform the Army's ongoing efforts to prevent suicide and improve Soldiers' overall psychological health and functioning. To do this, investigators from the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS), the University of Michigan, Harvard Medical School, the University of California-San Diego, and the National Institute of Mental Health will conduct an epidemiologic study of mental health, pyshcological resilience, suicide risk, suicide-related behaviors, and suicide deaths in the Army. The study will evaluate representative samples of Soldiers across all phases of Army service, both retrospectively and prospectively. Army STARRS is not a single study, but rather an integrated design of seven epidemiologic and neurobiologic studies: All Army Study (AAS), New Soldier Study (NSS), Historical Administrative Data Study (HADS), Pre-Post Deployment Study (PPDS), Clinical Reappraisal Study (CRS), and two Soldier Health Outcomes Studies (SHOS-A and SHOS-B).
SRO Project Period	07/2009 - 06/2015
Data Col Period	01/2011 - 04/2014
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates			
PreProduction Start: 07/01/2009		***Pretest Start:***	
Pretest End:		***Recruitment Start:***	
Staffing Completed:		***GIT Start:***	
SS Train Start:		***SS Train End:***	
DC Start:		***DC End:*** 04/30/2014	

Other Project Team Members:	Lead Team: Lisa Holland, Lisa Lewandowski-Romps, Lisa Wood, ZoAnne Blackburn, Theresa Short, Andrew Hupp, Margaret Hudson, Kathy LaDronka, Bill Lokers, Andrew Piskowrowski, Kyle Kwaiser, Ryan Yoder, Ruth Phillippou, Lisa Carn, Nancy Gebler
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak; SMS; Project specific system (GSMS and PPDSMS)
Data Col Tool	Blaise IS
Hardware	Laptop; Desktop; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	Blaise 4.8 BIA ; Other (GSMS for logging); External vendor (Apperson and ITS for scanning)
QC Recording Tool	Live monitoring; Other (Olive system)
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Cash, post ($20, $25, $50)
Payment Method	Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office

- -

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (Army STARRS)	**Project Phase**	Closing
Risk Level	*Some Concerns*		
Monthly Update	In April, project activities continued to be focused on analysis; user support; and work with biomarker data. We made some progress on the documentation for AAS, but still have quite a bit of documentation left to do before this phase of		

the project ends June 30. Below is a summary of April activities and issues.

This report includes Year 6 Army STARRS activities only; STARRS LS activities are reported separately.

1.   Management
a.   Project management: Some progress was made on project documentation, but it was still limited due to staff being assigned to other activities. Cost monitoring and staff support were ongoing throughout the month.
b.   Finance: Our March costs were $124,793 total, which is an under-run of $19,303 or 13% of our projected cost for the month. The under-run was due to a timesheet error correction from last month, and fewer hours worked than projected for a variety of staff.   We now are projecting a small surplus of $11,945 (total). We anticipate that the amount of the projected surplus will remain stable in the coming months, and we expect to end the project with a small under-run at the close of Year 6.
c.   We submitted our Quarter 23 financial summary to HJF this month, with a small number of items requiring cost variance explanations.
d.   Contract: a revision to the PAF-R is awaiting signature in the SRC Directors office.
e.   Staffing: No issues.
f.   IRB: No issues.
g.   Security: No issues.
2.   Issues being tracked:
a.   GWAS (genetic) data files were finalized and submitted to PGC (Psychiatrics Genomics Consortium) this month.
b.   We are finalizing preparation for the GWAS files for Emory University; expect those data to be delivered early Mary.
c.   We are awaiting PI decisions on whether or not PPDS survey data, NSS neurocognitive data, and GWAS data from NSS and PPDS will be submitted to ICPSR. This is not in our current scope or budget, and we will estimate staffing and cost (and add this to our timeline) when we get more information from the research team.
d.   We are awaiting PI assignments for the final project report to NIMH and the Army, which is due 30 September. If the work is not completed by 30 June (the end of Year 6 funding), we will need to decide how to staff and pay for this work.
3.   Research Data Enclave
a.   Drop box activity and user support continues at a fairly high level, no issues.
b.   The team continues to receive and process biomarker data.
c.   The new Windows server has been installed, with minimal system down time. This completes our major hardware updates.

4.   Analysis/publications:
a.   The team is working on writing the second injury/accident and suicidality paper. The Michigan team is collaborating with Army scientists on this effort.
b.   The AAS/PTS0 work group has developed tables and figures using the combined AAS/PPDS dataset, replicating Harvard's earlier suicide correlate and prevalence work based on AAS only data. The team is working with Harvard to ensure that the coding and analytical approach is the same as that used in the initial work.
c.   The methods team has been working on analyses of PPDS T3 survey data and paradata; evaluating contact information, T3 response rates (including refusal rates), nonresponse-adjusted estimates by call, and other information on the results from T3.
d.   The paper on the impact of the timing of the mode switch in the mixed mode T3 study is currently being circulated for review. These results will be presented at JSM (Joint Statistical Meetings) conference in August.
e.   The AAS chart book tables including sample weighted demographics files were completed and delivered to USUHS. The component chartbook tables (separating regular army, guard and reserve) are in the final QC stages and will be delivered soon.
f.   The PPDS Time 3 system development/lessons learned paper was presented at the April IBUC (International Blaise Users Group Conference).
g.   Imputed files for the PPDS longitudinal dataset have bene delivered to Harvard. Harvard is conducting the post-imputation edits on their sections and creating the composite diagnostic variables. The constructed weights for T0 and T2oT3 have been delivered; updated documentation for these weights is under final review.
5.   Archiving and documentation: some progress was made on documentation this month but it continues to be a challenge to find time to work on this.
a.   Archiving for PPDS Time 3 and SHOS-B data: to be done
b.   NSS and AAS survey methodology reports are close to being finished.
c.   The user guide for the combined AAS/PPDS analysis datafile needs to be updated for the AAS public use data only
d.   Survey methodology reports for PPDS, other components: to be done
e.   The Report of SRO Activities is being worked.
f.   We have an outline for the final report to the Army; we expect to receive assignments for this report in the near future.
6.   Public use data files:
a.   We met with ICPSR and they are working on programming the application portal to request access to the Army

STARRS data. We expect to release the AAS and NSS survey data for access through a virtual data enclave in June.

7.   Data management activities: the team continues to respond to queries from users and receive, log and store data coming from the Army. This continues to be a major activity on the project. This month we have completed the following activities:

a.   GWAS data delivered to PGC

b.   Social anxiety data for PPDS and NSS transferred to the Flux system

c.   PPDS weights transferred to the Flux system

d.   MicroRNA sample files provided to UCSD. Analysis data will be delivered to Michigan on hard drives when the assays are complete. Michigan will swap IDs and load the data on the Enclave and Flux.

e.   Codebooks were refreshed and reloaded for AAS/PPDS T0 integrated dataset (updated weights); AAS (updated weights); and SHOS-A (blood tube and consent table updated)

f.   Quarter 16 (Oct-Dec 2014) administrative data extracts are being delivered to Michigan. The team checks to ensure the files are not corrupt, and places the file in storage. The Q16 pull includes three biannually requested All Army snapshot files.

g.   Army STARRS analysts requested a separate data pull for files of soldier deaths, which will be integrated with the All Army snapshot files

h.   Tube Type variable columns were removed from NSS, SHOS-A and PPDS data tables. These variables will be updated and reloaded when the final inventory is received from Rutgers after all blood analyses are completed.

8.   Participant outreach:

a.   We will send an email to all respondents in May. We have asked for updated address information from the Army; and will incorporate it into our May mailing if the files are received by early May. The timeline for receiving the additional approvals required for transferring identifying information to Michigan is not known.

9.   Related projects

a.   Workplace violence: work continues, no issues.

b.   We received one email saying "The VA appears to be interested" in the proposal to conduct interviews with soldiers leaving the Army. No official word has been received, and we have not been asked for a formal budget. (ballpark SRO #15-0051 was submitted to Harvard and USUHS)

10.   Upcoming Meetings:

a.   The Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) will meet at UCSD May 28-29. Heeringa, Wagner, and Gebler will attend.

Special Issues

We are awaiting PI decisions on whether or not PPDS survey data, NSS neurocognitive data, and GWAS data from NSS and PPDS will be submitted to ICPSR. This is not in our current scope or budget, and we will estimate staffing and cost (and add this to our timeline) when we get more information from the research team.

We are awaiting PI assignments for the final project report to NIMH and the Army, which is due 30 September. If the work is not completed by 30 June (the end of Year 6 funding), we will need to decide how to staff and pay for this work.

There is still quite a bit of documentation left to do, and not a lot of time left to get it done. We will work to prioritize the outstanding pieces, and get as much done as possible before the project ends.

Cost
Apr 11, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	30,991,640.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	31,466,527.00
Total Budget:	31,478,471.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	11,945.00
Reason For Variance:	We anticipate completing this study with a small positive balance.

Projections
Apr 11, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	144,096.00
Actual Dollars Used:	124,793.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	19,303.00
Reason For Variance:	Fewer hours were worked than projected. Also, last month's timesheet error was corrected.

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study (A-STARRS LS)
Project Mode	Primary: Web Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 5,696,399.00 ***InDirect Budget:*** 3,133,016.00 ***Total Budget:*** 8,829,415.00
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:*** Not submitted Yet
Project Team	***Project Lead:*** Nancy J Gebler ***Budget Analyst:*** William Lokers ***Production Manager:*** Ruth B Philippou ***Senior Project Advisor:*** Mary P Maher ***Production Manager:*** Margaret Lee Hudson ***Production Manager:***
Proposal #:	no data
Description:	This project is a continuation of the Army STARRS study (Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers). For STARRS LS, we will attempt to reinterview all respondents form the All Army Study (AAS), New Soldier Study (NSS) and Pre-Post Deployment Study (PPDS) samples using a web-phone multi mode study. Each of the approximately 70,000 eligible respondents will be invited to participate once every two years. In addition to reinterviewing the AAS, NSS and PPDS samples; STARRS LS will continue to maintain and support the Research Data Enclave, allowing members of the research team and collaborators to analyze primary Army STARRS data as well as de-identified historical administrative data received from the Army and Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, STARRS LS will continue to receive and link de-identified administrative data to the survey data (from the original Army STARRS data collection as well as STARRS LS surveys). These data will also be made available in the Research Data Enclave.
SRO Project Period	02/2015 - 11/2019
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 11/2019
Security Plan	NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	02/01/2015	***Pretest Start:***	10/01/2015
Pretest End:	12/31/2015	***Recruitment Start:***	
Staffing Completed:		***GIT Start:***	
SS Train Start:		***SS Train End:***	
DC Start:	02/01/2016	***DC End:***	04/30/2019

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

‒ ‒

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (A-STARRS LS) **Project Phase** Planning
Risk Level	*Some Concerns*
Monthly Update	During April, we worked with Harvard on adjusting the sample design, analyzed contact information, continued to build the project team, planed for data collection, coordinated management planning with the MSMS development team, and received a signed charter from our project SPA. Details by major activity are listed below.

1.   Management

a.   Project management: submitted and received approval for the project charter

b.   Continued to work on project management plan documentation, and timeline detail

c.   Developed and submitted a monthly report to the PIs

d.   Scheduled regular team meetings, to ensure that all task leads have a view of the full project.

2.   Finance:

a.   We received the Year 1 subaward from HJF, and submitted minor edits to the wording. We expect the contract to be signed in the near future.

b.   We continue to track the Army STARRS PAF revision, and will submit one for STARRS LS when the Army STARRS PAF revision is approved.

c.   We created our first CRS report. Our total charges for February and March were $34,432 total cost. We have begun fine tuning our cost projections. This will be an ongoing activity for the next several months.

d.   We have been asked to adjust the data collection period from four years of ongoing work, to 2 one-year waves of data collection in 2016 and 2018. We also have been notified that Harvard students will not be doing any data collection work, and that effort (and budget) will be moved to Michigan. We still need to finalize the scope change and revise our cost estimates for these two changes.

e.   We are still waiting to hear if USUHS will move processing respondent payments to Michigan. That will require another scope and budget revision if the decision is to have Michigan process respondent payments.

3.   Technical systems:

a.   We received, and accepted, the technical evaluation team's recommendation to use MSMS. We continue to discuss the data collection software, expect to finalize that decision next month.

b.   Margaret is working with Jim R. to plan the integration of project work with the MSMS development activities. Andrew Hupp is joining this effort to develop and specify project requirements. TSG is assembling their team for STARRS LS.

c.   Nancy, James, Patty, Gregg met with Raghu and Cathy T. to review the plan for using STARRS LS as first major project to use MSMS. All were in agreement that this is a good fit.

4.   Sampling:

a.   We continued work on evaluating PPDS T3 data to help fine-tune our data collection protocols.

b.   We updated our address flags and produced several tables describing the amount and type of contact information available for respondents eligible to be in the STARRS LS sample.

c.   We are running the STARRS LS sample through a reverse directory match program, to see how much additional information we can get from the telephone numbers we have in our address files.

5.   Staffing:

a.   Rachel LeClere will be joining the team to assist Margaret with developing recruitment materials and other management tasks; and work on technical system documentation and testing.

b.   Jeff Hay will be working with Steve Heeringa this summer on data analysis for Army STARRS, and will be joining our team meetings to learn more about the survey management process.

6.   Data collection planning:

a.   We continue to evaluate the proposed data collection design and assumptions, with a goal of optimizing cost, response rate, and interview count.

b.   James and Nancy are developing a memo to the PI's to outline the decisions needed, and recommend our preferred course of action.

c.   We are tracking our request for address updates from the Army.   We have requested May 1 delivery, but that has not been confirmed by the Army.

d.   We continue to work on tracking plans, and developed an initial summary of tracking steps.

e.   We have notified the SSL of the change in plans to compress the data collection into two one-year waves, and to increase calling effort, taking on scope that was going to be done at Harvard. The SSL indicated this should not be a problem.

7.   Security: No issues.

Special Issues

Overall, things are going smoothly. There are several areas of risk that we are tracking.

•   Locating respondents: we hope to have the Army address updates soon.

•   Illume-Blaise 5 decision: this decision is needed by May 15.

•   Timeline: we will need to submit our pilot IRB application in June to have it ready for October pilot (we must get USUHS IRB approval in addition to UM's IRB approval prior to data collection)

•   Scope and design uncertainty: the PI's are still evaluating design options. We are pushing to get decisions made soon. When the design is finalized, we will need to re-evaluate our budget, and our data collection staffing plan as well.

•   Busy 2016: We are aware that 2016 is a very busy year for SRO, and we will be competing for resources. We are trying to get decisions made as quickly as possible so we can reserve staff time and make sure we can handle the added work.

•   Year 6 scope drift: There will be some work left over when Army STARRS Year 6 funding ends June 30. We currently do not have staff time set aside, or money in our budget, for this work. When the workscope is defined we will create cost estimates for the work, and then will work with the PI's to set priorities and identify funding sources.

Cost
Apr 09, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	34,432.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	8,829,415.00
Total Budget:	8,829,415.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	We are still setting up CRS, do not have projections updated.

Projections
Apr 09, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	We did not have projections entered last month, we are just getting CRS set up. The amount spent in February and March is very reasonable for our initial startup activities.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	41228	52%	3.5 (PH3); 4.5 (Ph4)
Goal at Completion:			
Current actual:	0	0	0
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	Donors' Moral Concerns About Biobanks: National Survey and Public Deliberation (Biobanks)
Project Mode	Primary: Mail Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 4
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Status	Current			
Budget	*Direct Budget:* 115,017.00	*InDirect Budget:* 63,834.00	*Total Budget:* 178,851.00

Principal Investigator/Client
Raymond De Vries (University of Michigan)
Tom Tomlinson (Michigan State University)

Funding Agency National Institute of Health

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

Project Team
Project Lead:	Lisa J Carn
Budget Analyst:	Dean E Stevens
Production Manager:	Lisa J Carn
Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager:	Lisa J Carn
Production Manager:	

Proposal #: no data

Description:
The purpose of this IRB exempt project is to explore public attitudes toward non- welfare interests in biobank research, especially around issues of consent. Eligibility requires agreement (from an adult at least 21-years-old) to attend an all-day democratic deliberation (DD) forum (if selected) plus the completion of three surveys. A packet will be mailed to residents of this ABS pool – drawn from households within a 50-60 mile radius of the forum locations in Ann Arbor and Lansing.

Respondents will express interest by submitting their contact information through an Illume application or by mailing back a response card. The SSL will follow up with phone contact using a Blaise screener to confirm eligibility, ask some basic (primarily demographic) questions, and address any respondent questions. The SSL will deliver data for all confirmed respondents to project staff, who will resume responsibility for all subsequent respondent contact (survey-sending&reminding, random assignment of respondent group, incentive-sending).

A pilot will take place in January-February to test current assumptions and to further refine overall design - for recruitment purposes, as well as for project team administration of the democratic deliberation event.

SRO Project Period 09/2013 - 06/2016
Data Col Period 01/2015 - 12/2015
Security Plan NA
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	10/05/2014	*Pretest Start:*	01/05/2015
Pretest End:	02/23/2015	*Recruitment Start:*	12/03/2014
Staffing Completed:	12/03/2014	*GIT Start:*	01/05/2015
SS Train Start:	12/15/2014	*SS Train End:*	12/20/2014
DC Start:	01/05/2015	*DC End:*	10/15/2015

Other Project Team Members:
Dean Stevens, Budget Analyst
Dave Dybicki, Blaise Programmer
Jas Sokhal, Illume Design
Qi Zhu, Data Manager
Paul Burton, Sampling
Paul Schulz, Sampling
Dan Zahs, Sampling
Becky Loomis, Production Assistant

Other Project Names:	Biobanks
Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; Illume
Hardware	NA
DE Software	Illume
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	UM Group (Medical School, Center for Bioethics and Medicine Science)
Payment Type	Check, post ($120, $30)
Payment Method	N/A

- -

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (Biobanks)	**Project Phase**	Initiation

Risk Level   *Not Rated*

Monthly Update   No update information available on April activities.

Special Issues

**Cost
May 31, 2015**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	0.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	0.00
Total Budget:	178,851.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

**Projections
May 31, 2015**

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 2014 (HRS 2014)
Project Mode	Primary: Mixed Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 12,565,944.00 ***InDirect Budget:*** 4,523,742.00 ***Total Budget:*** 17,089,686.00
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (SRC) Mary Beth Ofstedal (SRC) Ken Langa (SRC)
Funding Agency	
IRB	***HUM#:*** HUM00061128 ***Period Of Approval:*** 2/5/2014 - 2/4/2015

Project Team

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

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	The Health and Retirement Study (HRS) is a national, longitudinal study conducted every two years since 1992. The study includes a representative sample of US residents aged 50 years and older. Every six years (three waves) a new cohort of US residents aged 50 to 55 are screened in to the study to maintain representativeness. In 2004, the early baby boomers were screened in and completed a baseline interview. In 2010, the mid baby boomer cohort was added as well as a minority oversample of both early and mid-baby boomers. In 2016, the late baby boomer cohort will be added. A series of physical measures and biomarkers are collected with half of all living respondents each wave as well as a self-administered questionnaire. Additionally, permission to link to Social Security Administration records and Veterans Administration (VA) records is requested. The HRS 2014 sample size is 23,029.
SRO Project Period	01/2014 - 01/2015
Data Col Period	02/2015 - 12/2014
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	06/01/2013	***Pretest Start:***	11/06/2013
Pretest End:	11/20/2013	***Recruitment Start:***	
Staffing Completed:		***GIT Start:***	03/19/2014
SS Train Start:	02/24/2014	***SS Train End:***	02/26/2014
DC Start:	02/28/2014	***DC End:***	04/04/2015

Other Project Team Members:	Jaime Koopman (Project Manager), Ian Ogden (Project Assistant), Heather Rejto (Project Assistant),
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Laptop
DE Software	N/A
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (80.00)
Payment Method	Check through STrak RPay System

- -

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (HRS 2014) **Project Phase** Closing
Risk Level	*On Track*
Monthly Update	HRS 2014 data collection ended on Saturday, April 4, 2015 (57 weeks of data collection). We ended with 20,132 interviews and a response rate of 87%. We are now in the closing stages of the project--finalizing sample lines, preparing a final report, processing returned equipment from the field, etc. Preproduction activities for 2016 have begun.
Special Issues	

Cost
Mar 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	16,570,687.76
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	16,692,922.99
Total Budget:	17,089,686.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	396,763.01
Reason For Variance:	Included in the projected cost to complete are the projected costs for the web/CATI Blaise 5/MSMS project. The projected variance represents a 2% underrun on the total budget. The original budget (prepared in 2011) was for 21,000 completed interviews. We completed about 900 less interviews than the original contract budget. We may need to use some of the underrun to cover the cost of dynamometer calibration. Once this is confirmed, we will project the costs for this activity.

Projections
Mar 31, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	93,399.37
Actual Dollars Used:	101,328.91
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-7,929.54
Reason For Variance:	There was a small amount of variance (overrun) for the month of March.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	20,030	86%	7.4
Goal at Completion:	20,030	86%	7.4
Current actual:	20,132 (4/24/15)	87%	7.3
Estimate at Complete:	20,132	87%	7.3
Variance:	102	1	.1

Other Measures   Physical Measures consent 96, Saliva consent 69, Blood consent 91

Project Name	HRS Cognitive Diagnosis Validation Study (CogVal)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 208,911.00 ***InDirect Budget:*** 75,207.00 ***Total Budget:*** 284,118.00
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (ISR) Mary Beth Ofstedal (ISR) Ken Langa (ISR)
Funding Agency	
IRB	***HUM#:*** ***Period Of Approval:***
Project Team	***Project Lead:*** Evanthia Leissou ***Budget Analyst:*** Richard Warren Krause ***Production Manager:*** Kathleen S Ladronka ***Senior Project Advisor:*** Mary P Maher ***Production Manager:*** ***Production Manager:***
Proposal #:	no data
Description:	For this project a sample of 60 main subjects and 60 family informants of those main subjects will be interviewed in person. The goal will be to complete interviews with 12 main sample members who have normal cognitive function (as determined by Michigan Alzheimer's Disease Center [MADC] information), 24 with mild cognitive impairment, and 24 with dementia, as well as to interview a family informant of each of the main sample members. SRO will administer a one-hour cognitive assessment to the main subjects and a 15 minute proxy assessment to the family informants. Both of those interview types will be completed with a Blaise instrument. In addition, SRO will obtain feedback from respondents regarding their experiences with the assessments via a brief paper and pencil interview.
SRO Project Period	01/2014 - 06/2014
Data Col Period	09/2014 - 11/2014
Security Plan	No

Milestone Dates

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

Other Project Team Members:	The team will be comprised of a survey director, production manager,six field interviewers, a Blaise programmer, help desk supervisor, help desk specialist, application programming supervisor, data ops research associate, office assistant, and a SPA.
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Laptop; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	N/A
QC Recording Tool	N/A
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, INF
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Cash, post
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox)

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (CogVal) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	*On Track*
Monthly Update	During April we assembled an SRO team and had a kick off meeting to review the workscope and plans. Some programming specs were given to the CAI programmer and were implemented. The PDMG team started testing in CTT.
	The training team started working on a training agenda and tentatively marked May 18-20 for a training in Ann Arbor.
	The sub-contract with the Group Health Research Institute was established and sent to the contract site on April 23.

Two IRB applications were submitted: 1) for the Seattle ACT sample we submitted an amendment to the IRBMed application which approved the MADC pilot protocol in fall 2014, and 2) for the CogUSA sample an amendment was submitted under the umbrella CogUSA project which also includes the saliva collection effort to be implemented in May-June 2015.

Special Issues

Cost
Apr 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	155,566.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	284,118.00
Total Budget:	284,118.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Apr 30, 2015

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	HRS Screening Initiatives (HRS Screening Initiatives)
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 3
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

Project Status Current

Budget	**Direct Budget:** 512,452.00 **InDirect Budget:** 184,484.00 **Total Budget:** 696,936.00
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (UM Survey Research Center) Mary Beth Ofstedal (UM Survey Research Center)

Funding Agency

IRB

HUM#:	*Period Of Approval:*

Project Team

Project Lead:	Frost Alexander Hubbard
Budget Analyst:	Richard Warren Krause
Production Manager:	Theresa Camelo
Senior Project Advisor:	Nicole G Kirgis
Production Manager:	Kyle Steven Kwaiser
Production Manager:	

Proposal #:   no data

Description: The purpose of the HRS Screening Initiative is to come up with a concrete plan for making the sample design and operational screening methods more cost efficient than what was done for HRS 2010-11. In addition, since the funding for the sampling work for HRS 2016 new cohort screening will not be received by the ISR until January 2015, the production sampling work of determining the number of PSUs and segments to select, creating the PSU sampling frame, and selecting PSUs, were all done under this budget.

The following were all conducted under this project's budget in order to design the optimal 2016 screening methods:
(1) A detailed analysis of the HRS 2010-11 screening results
(2) an experiment to examine the household rostering method which provides the best balance between high coverage and response rates and lowest cost (i.e. interviewer attempts)
(3) a tracking experiment to determine the most cost effective method(s) for determining the current address of the LBB birth cohort members identified during the 2010,
(4) developing a 2016 sample design which was submitted as part of the proposal sent to NIA for sending for the 2016 new birth cohort screening.

Note: After a 9/18/2013 meeting with the HRS PIs, we found out that due to the sequestration, funding for this initiative had been cut. We told the HRS PIs that we would keep the budget reined in. However, the PI's did not specify the amount to which the budget should be limited

In terms of presenting results regarding the HRS 2010-11 screening, from August through November 2013, we conducted in-depth analyses of the HRS 2010-2011 screening and sample design for David Weir to present to the HRS Data Monitoring Committee in September 2012 and for Richard Valliant to present to the Committee on National Statistics on November 19, 2012. Both of these presentations generated many ideas for making the HRS sampling and screening methods more efficient.

Since the both the Cycle 7 and 2011-2019 National Survey of Family Growth's (NSFG) screening cooperation rates have been consistently higher than what HRS achieved in 2010-11, as of April 2013 we are in the process of adapting the NSFG screening techniques for the planned August-November 2013 screening experiment to improve the efficiency of field screening. The use of external information will include the acquisition of commercial lists of households which contain demographic information that may be used in screening, investigation of the availability and the feasibility of the use of motor vehicle records, and contacts with the Health Maintenance Organization Research Network (HMORN) to determine whether membership lists can be used in some states to facilitate screening. Note that as of April 2013, we have determined that using the HMORN is not feasible for HRS 2016 screening because the HMORN will not give us a list of their members. Instead, the HMORN would send a letter to their members asking if they would like to opt-in to the study.

Address lists will be compiled utilizing information from external databases such as MSG and Aristotle. The DMV data was too difficult to obtain for states other than Michigan and the Valassis data did not have commercial data at the address level. Three PSUs and 3 segments per PSU were selected to reflect geographic and demographic variations. Experienced interviewers were be hired and trained for the screening experiment during August 2013. Each interviewer completed screening interviews in at least one segment.

SRO Project Period	09/2012 - 12/2015
Data Col Period	08/2013 - 10/2015
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates		
	PreProduction Start: 03/01/2013	*Pretest Start:*
	Pretest End:	*Recruitment Start:*
	Staffing Completed:	*GIT Start:*
	SS Train Start: 08/20/2013	*SS Train End:* 08/21/2013
	DC Start: 08/22/2013	*DC End:* 11/03/2013

Other Project Team Members: Frost Hubbard, Heidi Guyer, Wen Chang, Nicole Kirgis, Piotr Dworak, Richard Valliant, Sunghee Lee, Theresa Camelo, Daniel Tomlin, Joel Devonshire, Emily Blascyzk, Marsha Skoman, Holly Ackerman, Deb Wilson, Heather Reijto, Jamie Koopman, Rick Krause, Daniel Guzman, Paul Burton, Kyle Kwaiser, Ann Vernier

Other Project Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys SurveyTrak; Other (Weblog for LBB/EGENX mailings)

Data Col Tool Blaise 4.8

Hardware Laptop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil

DE Software NA

QC Recording Tool Other (None used)

Incentive Yes, R

    Administration SRO Group

    Payment Type NA

    Payment Method NA

Report Period Apr, 2015 (HRS Screening Initiatives)   **Project Phase** Initiation

Risk Level   *Not Rated*

Monthly Update No update information available on April activities.

Special Issues

Cost
May 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	0.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	0.00
Total Budget:	696,936.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
May 31, 2015

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	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:** 792,030.00 **InDirect Budget:** 438,195.00 **Total Budget:** 1,230,225.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Heather Hill (Harvard Graduate School of Education) Patty Maher (ISR PI)

Funding Agency

IRB	**HUM#:** HUM90379	**Period Of Approval:** 6/25/2014-6/25/2015
Project Team	**Project Lead:** Barbara Lohr Ward	
	Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens	
	Production Manager: Russell W Stark	
	Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul	
	Production Manager: Anthony Romanowski	
	Production Manager:	

Proposal #: no data

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

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

Milestone Dates

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

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	Apr, 2015 (MTTS)	**Project Phase**	Implementing
Risk Level	*On Track*		

Monthly Update

During April, 2015, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan
• Participated in weekly project management meetings with the research team to discuss preparation progress, production schedule, and work scope.
• Adjusted monthly projections and staffing plan based on estimated project schedule and district recruitment activity.
• Prepared and delivered March 2015 monthly report.

Task 2: Sampling
• Participated in research team and other meetings as needed to respond to sampling and procedural questions.
• Reviewed weekly sampling reports
• Provided replacement schools as needed for district-level research applications
• Began preparation of an additional replicate of districts

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

Task 4: CAI Programming

Task 5: Systems Programming
• Data Management
o Assisted with and advised on development of underlying tables and variables for SRIS.
□ Created definitions for new variables relating to district recruitment.
□ Created variables for preferred, alternate and teacher-defined recording dates.
□ Updated SRIS tables with new variables.
o Loaded production data into SRIS and rostering databases on a weekly basis
o Loaded test data into developmental pages as needed.
o Created district recruitment report (to replace manually-created report). Programmed a scheduled process to produce a weekly automated recruitment report.
o Began development of field progress reports for MKT production and MQI production.

• SRIS Development
o Held weekly meetings with SRO technical team to discuss and elaborate various elements of SRIS design. Held meetings to elaborate logging procedures and programming needs, need to additional changes to research application (IRB) page.
o Finalized programming for new district recruitment variables (used to track special requirements). Place revisions to district IRB page in production.
o Finalized document logging page; fixed bugs and placed into production.
o Programmed equipment logging "out" page. Made modifications to error messages and operations, tested and re-tested and placed into production.
o Programmed equipment logging "in" page. Made modifications based on testing and user feedback: incorporated error messages, added equipment status codes, added a verification page. Tested and re-tested after modifications and placed into production.
o Specified teacher and district data entry page to incorporate best shipping method, teacher-defined recording dates (requested by research team).
o Began programming for reports display in SRIS.

Task 6: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring

Task 7: Training

Task 8: Main Data Collection
- Refined district recruitment production status reports. Prepared weekly reports.
- District Recruitment –Research Applications
o Mailed replicate 4 letters on 4/1/2015
o Continued to refine application processes, checklists and text for district research applications based on new questions/situations encountered.
o Prepared and submitted research applications for six districts (as of 4/25/2015). One application prepared and waiting for submission portal to open.
- School Rosters
o 63 total completed school rosters, 33 completed during April
o 38 total schools contacted with rosters outstanding (unreturned)
o Roster request format: 85 via email, 8 via phone, 4 via fax.
- MKT Production
o Cohort 1 – 11 schools, 21 teachers. Second MKT shipment prepared.
o Cohort 2 – 10 schools, 20 teachers. First MKT shipment, thank-you letter shipped.
o Cohort 3 – 9 schools, 19 teachers. Principal prenotification, teacher prenotification, first MKT, thank-you letter shipped.
o Cohort 4 – 10 schools, 20 teachers. Principal prenotification, teacher prenotification, first MKT shipped.
o Cohort 5 – 16 schools, 32 teachers. Principal prenotification shipped.
- Procedures Refinement
o Revised MKT teacher communications based on feedback from respondents: thank you letter, web invitation and web reminders.
o Tested web survey application.
o Assisted research team with review/revision of teacher communications & instructions for MQI.
o Evaluated timing of teacher communications based on feedback from field and made recommendations for changes in timing of web survey invitation.
- Data Collection Equipment Management
o Tested MQI equipment set-up and charging.
o Tested SD card logging procedures.
o Ordered special power strips for charging.
o Prepared 20 boxes for equipment shipping.
o Ordered extension cords for MQI camera units.

Task 9: Post Collection Processing
Task 10: Weighting
Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

Cost information: Harvard subcontract funded by the National Science Foundation

Total survey funding available:	$	1,230,225
Total Expended as of 3/31/2015	$	292,020
Expected cost at complete:	$	1,218,536
Expected Variance:	$	11,692

Cost explanation:
The cost estimate reflects total survey funding available and awarded to Michigan, current expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award based on the current estimates of work scope. This report incorporates additional labor for processing research applications now and into the Fall of 2015. The cost estimate includes the purchase of SD micro storage cards for the tablet computers ($15,550 in total cost) and an extension of data collection to 3/31/2016. The cost estimate does not include release of an additional replicate of districts, or other work scope related to processing classroom videos submitted by teachers that will be incurred by Lesli Scott's group in EWB (to be budgeted separately).

The projected variance anticipates a possible underrun due to anticipated SRO work scope decreases, however there is uncertainty in these projections. The effort to complete district research applications and recruit schools has just begun, and there is considerable uncertainty regarding the total effort that will be needed. The MQI shipment protocol will be more complex due to the need to tailor shipping & contact activities by district. Teacher participation rates are not yet known. All projections are based on historical averages for similar work. These are areas that are being carefully monitored and projections will be updated as needed.

Special Issues

Areas of risk:

There exists some schedule risk due to the production schedule.
• District recruitment has been both slower than had been anticipated and has required more effort than previously anticipated. These factors are delaying the launch of both MKT and MQI production. The slower pace of district recruitment will push more sample into the Fall 2015 schedule. District recruitment will extend into the Fall of 2015. We are anticipating that data collection will extend at least until March 2016.

There exists some financial risk due to work scope changes, however other work scope reductions may offset some of the risk. The project will likely need to be rebudgeted after production begins and more is known about cooperation rates and the impact of the work scope changes. SRO will incorporate replicates in the sample to better manage financial risk during the Fall 2015 production schedule.
• Scope increases include a larger effort to complete research applications, launching multiple small mailings, and tailoring shipping activities by district due to district requirements. Instead of launching one large bulk mailing for the MKT (and following with MQI), SRO will launch multiple small sample mailings (some of which incorporate tailoring materials/approach by district) which require more management and monitoring. Other scope increases include the use of color printing for recruitment, printing color Quick Guide booklets, increased equipment shipment costs, and printing more recruitment pages than planned. We are carefully monitoring costs and updating projections as we move through the spring data collection in order to better anticipate costs in the larger Fall 2015 production period.
o As we gain more experience with the sample it is becoming clear that the video data collection activities will need to be tailored by district, reducing the efficiency of bulk-mailing operations. We are incorporating multiple flags and other information into the technical systems to provide directions for those assigned to prepare materials for the video data collection effort. We will be increasing the estimate for programming to accommodate these changes.
o Rostering costs to date have been lower than projected, however we note that most districts coming on board were "early adopters" and eager to participate in the study. We are retaining the more robust estimates for rostering in the Fall, assuming a lower level of cooperation as the majority of the sample hits the field. Rostering costs will be carefully monitored as production progresses.
o Michigan is processing the bulk of the district-level IRB applications, and will gather necessary district-level academic schedules as needed. The effort to complete IRB applications has just begun, and appears to be substantial. Michigan will carefully monitor the labor necessary to complete IRB applications and will make adjustments to the level of effort and cost estimates as needed.
• Anticipated work scope decreases include elimination of the pilot, some initial district recruitment effort, and questionnaire printing. Teacher thank you notes and most reminder calls will be replaced with email communications.

The delay in the launch of production will impact SRO staffing projections and financial projections. Cost projections are being closely monitored and adjusted as necessary. A contract modification is being prepared for EWB work scope associated with video management and processing.

Cost
Apr 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	292,000.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	1,218,536.00
Total Budget:	1,230,225.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	11,692.00
Reason For Variance:	Work scope changes (such as elimination of the pilot) are leading us to project a slightly lower than budget end result.

Projections
Apr 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	93,425.00
Actual Dollars Used:	59,074.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	34,351.00
Reason For Variance:	Delays in production led to lower than anticipated expenses in labor (mailing/shipping) and non-labor items and respondent payments. TSG staff charged fewer hours than anticipated; a large timesheet correction from February also reduced current expenses.

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	MILES Lupus Study (MILES)
Project Mode	Primary: Mail Secondary: Telephone Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

Budget	***Direct Budget:***	134,862.00	***InDirect Budget:*** 74,848.00	***Total Budget:***	209,710.00

Principal Investigator/Client	Emily Somers (University of Michigan School of Public Health) Sioban Harlow (University of Michigan School of Public Health)
Funding Agency	Department of Health and Human Services - Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
IRB	***HUM#:*** Pending ***Period Of Approval:*** Pending
Project Team	***Project Lead:*** Cheryl Wiese ***Budget Analyst:*** Janelle P Cramer ***Production Manager:*** Lisa J Carn ***Senior Project Advisor:*** Heidi Marie Guyer ***Production Manager:*** ***Production Manager:***
Proposal #:	no data
Description:	This project is designed to recruit a population-based control group that is frequency matched on key demographic characteristics of lupus cases selected from a registry. To do so, SRO will sample households from Washtenaw and Wayne counties in Michigan, mail a screener questionnaire, and make follow-up phone calls to those who did not return the screener SAQ in order to complete the screener by phone. The goal is to recruit a sample of 720 participants between the ages of 18 and 74 of whom 90% are female and 56% are African American. Phone calls will be made to identify respondents that meet these characteristics based on the shortfall from the mail returns. The expectation is that 70% will then agree to complete a clinic visit when contacted by the School of Public Health project staff. A total of approximately 2,700 addresses will be selected in Washtenaw and Wayne counties in Michigan. The addresses will be sent to a sample vendor to obtain the names and phone numbers associated with those addresses, and those names will be used in the mailings. Those in which a name cannot be found will be mailed to "resident" at the selected address. After a full round of SAQ effort (pre-notification letter, initial mailing with SAQ, post card reminder, and 2nd SAQ mailing to the unresolved), SSL interviewers will conduct recruitment calls to either complete the screener interview by phone or encourage respondents to return the SAQ. It is anticipated that the mail phase of the project will yield about a 40% response rate, and that the telephone follow-up will boost the overall response rate to approximately 55%. An SRO sampling statistician will select the Address Based Sample (ABS) in Wayne and Washtenaw counties from a Delivery Sequence File (DSF) or similar with a 2-1 oversample of residents of the City of Detroit to account for the demographics of the cases. A pretest or pilot will not take place. However, data collection will be conducted in three phases. An initial release of 500 cases will first be released to determine whether the assumptions are accurate. Releases 2 and 3 will be released in August and September. The sample may be augmented depending on the achieved rates compared to the estimated. Returned paper screeners will be data entered by the SSL staff and telephone interviews will be completed by the SSL as well. A Blaise instrument will be used to data enter the paper screeners and to conduct the telephone interview. SMS will be used for sample management. Client reports will be generated and provided on a weekly basis.
SRO Project Period	04/2014 - 03/2015
Data Col Period	07/2014 - 03/2015
Security Plan	NA
Milestone Dates	

PreProduction Start: 04/01/2014		***Pretest Start:***
Pretest End:		***Recruitment Start:***
Staffing Completed:		***GIT Start:***
SS Train Start:		***SS Train End:***
DC Start: 07/15/2014		***DC End:*** 03/19/2015

Other Project Team Members:	Dave Dybicki (Blaise/SMS), Jennie Williams (data manager), Dan Zahs (senior statistician), Paul Schultz (statistician)

Other Project Names:	The Michigan Lupus Epidemiology & Surveillance Program Cohort and Biobank - Control Group Recruitment
Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Desktop
DE Software	NA
QC Recording Tool	NA
Incentive	NA
Administration	NA
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid (2)
Payment Method	NA

- -

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (MILES)	**Project Phase**	Closing

Risk Level   *Some Concerns*

Monthly Update $103,826.01/111,003.07 in year 1 charged of 112,334 budgeted (Variance on Yr 1 budget shows $9508 underrun) $109,749 charged in yr 2 of 103,000 budgeted for a $9666.63 overrun...Bottom line is a $6300

Special Issues Budget overrun of $6300, largely attributed to $6600 more in pre-incentive than originally budgeted.

We delivered 150 more cases than promised; I would hope the client is pleased.

Cost
Apr 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	204,606.92
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	224,354.68
Total Budget:	209,710.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-6,284.00
Reason For Variance:	Although it appears there may be an overrun, we have conservatively estimated postage costs, respondent incentive reconciliation, and the production manager charged more time this month and last than were budgeted. I believe we will show on target spending next month.

Projections
Apr 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	19,846.38
Actual Dollars Used:	20,696.93
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-850.00
Reason For Variance:	production manager hours were over projection ($2500 instead of $1K) combined with delay of cash reconciliation (+$1900) which will hit in March. Survey Tech II hours were greater than projected, too.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	867	37	
Goal at Completion:	716	40	
Current actual:	867	34	
Estimate at Complete:	867	43	
Variance:	+151	+3	

Other Measures Final eligibility is 15.7% of total sample, which is consistent with what we found in the pilot.

Project Name	Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot (MTF-WPSP Year 2)
Project Mode	Primary: Web Secondary: Mail Total of Modes: 2

Project Type	Sponsored Projects		**Project Status**	Current

Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 226,233.00	***InDirect Budget:*** 125,560.00	***Total Budget:*** 351,793.00

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

SRO Project Period	08/2012 - 08/2015
Data Col Period	04/2014 - 08/2014
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

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

Other Project Team Members: Gina-Qian Yang Cheung, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Hueichun Peng, Andrew Piskorowski, Aaron Pearson, Max Malhotra, Lloyd Hemingway

Other Project Names:	MTF Web
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	Apr, 2015 (MTF-WPSP Year 2) **Project Phase** Initiation
Risk Level	*Not Rated*
Monthly Update	No update information available on April activities.

Special Issues

Cost
May 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	0.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	0.00
Total Budget:	351,793.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
May 31, 2015

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	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:**	29,713,370.00	**InDirect Budget:** 10,439,833.00	**Total Budget:**	40,153,203.00

Principal Investigator/Client	Joyce Abma (NCHS) Mick Couper (ISR)
Funding Agency	NCHS, CDC, NICHD
IRB	**HUM#:** 0002716 **Period Of Approval:** 7/17/13 - 7/17/14

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:	Daniel Tomlin

Proposal #:	no data
Description:	The NSFG is a national survey of women and men 15-44 years of age designed to provide national estimates of factors affecting pregnancy and birth rates, including sexual activity, cohabitation, marriage, divorce, contraceptive use, miscarriage and stillbirth, infertility, and use of medical services for family planning and infertility. NSFG 2010-2020 includes eight years of continuous data collection starting in September 2011 and ending in 2019. Every year, new PSUs will be selected to replace last year's non-self representing PSUs and self-representing PSUs, and the project will continue to collect data from a set of major self representing PSUs throughout the entire data collection period. Target number of interviews is approximately 5000 per year.
SRO Project Period	09/2010 - 07/2020
Data Col Period	09/2011 - 06/2019
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

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

Other Project Team Members:	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst, Jennifer Kelley--Project Manager
Other Project Names:	
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	Other (ODK)
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	Apr, 2015 (NSFG 2010-2020)	**Project Phase**	Implementing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	Q14 ended on March 28. The final screening, main and overall response rates were the lowest to date. A number of areas remain unstaffed and additional recruiting efforts took place to staff 4-5 additional areas. 5 newly hired interviewers will be trained in Ann Arbor in May. Q15 began on March 29 and continues through June 20th. The newly trained interviewers will join the field staff mid-quarter, in week 7. Year 5 development continues with questionnaire changes, touchscreen screener development, age-range expansion, and an exploration of other technical areas/systems where improvements may be realized. Considerable work was completed this month in estimating the sampling impact of the age-range expansion, drafting documentation and meeting with the client and the funders regarding the various options and their respective sampling and cost considerations. A funders meeting was held in		

April as well as a quarterly meeting.

Special Issues   High travel costs and PI/client concerns regarding iwer pay rates and recruitment continue to be special issues.

Cost
Apr 13, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	18,100,722.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	43,011,645.00
Total Budget:	40,153,203.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-2,200,186.00
Reason For Variance:	Contract modifications have increased the total budget to $40,601,208. Once those are reflected in CRS, the total variance will be reduced. NCHS is also requesting additional funds from NSFG funders to cover a base increase in year 5 (Sept2015-Aug2016).

Projections
Apr 13, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	418,569.11
Actual Dollars Used:	462,538.99
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	43,969.88
Reason For Variance:	Interviewing hours and travel dollars were higher than expected in March.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1250	75%	9.0
Goal at Completion:	1250	75%	9.0
Current actual:	508	50%	10.2
Estimate at Complete:	1300	70%	10.0
Variance:	50	5	1.0

Other Measures

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:** 695,853.00 **InDirect Budget:** 386,200.00 **Total Budget:** 1,082,053.00
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:**   3/4/2015 - 3/3/2016

Project Team   **Project Lead:**   Meredith A House

                Budget Analyst: Bethany Benton

                Production Manager: Kathleen S Ladronka

                Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul

                Production Manager:

                Production Manager:

Proposal #:   no data

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

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

SRO Project Period   04/2014 - 03/2018

Data Col Period   03/2015 - 06/2015

Security Plan   Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	08/01/2014	**Pretest Start:**	11/10/2014
Pretest End:	11/13/2014	**Recruitment Start:**	02/02/2015
Staffing Completed:	01/23/2015	**GIT Start:**	
SS Train Start:	02/25/2015	**SS Train End:**	02/26/2015
DC Start:	03/02/2015	**DC End:**	05/22/2015

Other Project Team Members: Louis Daher, Larry Daher, Emmanuel Ellis + other help desk (private network tech team), Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Becky Loomis, Max Malhotra, Shaowei Sun, Laura Yoder (data management)

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

---

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (AHRB)	**Project Phase**	Implementing

Risk Level   *On Track*

Monthly Update

Following up from last month, Adrian's data collection was Thursday, March 26th and Friday, March 27th. 148 students completed surveys, 139 completed the NC tasks. Results after 3 schools are as follows:

- Consent Rate   33% (Ranges from 23% to 61%)
- Survey Participation Rate   80%
- Neurocog Participation Rate   77%
- Retention Rate (% return for NCs)   97%
- Voluntary Referrals   <0.5% (1)
- At Risk Referrals   8.8% (36)

No data collections were held in April. Whitmore Lake is scheduled for May 5th and 6th. Their consent were sent home 4/20-4/21. Belleville will take place May 18-22. Belleville is large and we are hoping for a high turn out to increase the number of participating students closer to 1,000, which is still half of the PI's goal.

The survey director and budget analyst created projections for what extending data collection into fall would cost. The cost would be about $120,000 direct more than the budget. SRO has not received official approval of this extension, but it is highly likely. 4/21, our meeting with study staff included Rick O'Neil, who is on board to help the PI recruit the final schools needed. The plan is for recruitment and logistics meetings to take place this spring, and move right into consent and data collection in Sept-Oct.

In general, April was spent on data processing prep, respondent payments, and prep for May admins.

Special Issues   Likely extension of wave 1 data collection into fall will mean extending staffing and possible re-training/new training.

Cost
Apr 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	456,373.75
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	1,017,444.08
Total Budget:	1,082,053.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	64,608.92
Reason For Variance:	Projections updated to reflect number of schools and students recruited for spring 2015 data collection. Extension into fall 2015 has not yet been approved by PI.

Projections
Apr 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	91,098.66
Actual Dollars Used:	78,333.82
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	12,764.84
Reason For Variance:	Some proctor and tech coord. hours projected for March will actually come through in April. A few non-salary items expected to hit in March did not come through.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	2,000		
Goal at Completion:	2,000		
Current actual:	393		
Estimate at Complete:	1,000		
Variance:			

Other Measures

| **Project Name** | Panel Study of Income Dynamics Childhood Experiences Web/Mail Project (PSID-CE (aka FES-CE)) |

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

Project Type   Sponsored Projects   **Project Status**   Current

Budget   *Direct Budget:*   412,530.00   *InDirect Budget:*   228,954.00   *Total Budget:*   641,484.00

Principal Investigator/Client   Vicki Freedman (U of M Survey Research Center)
James Smith (RAND)
Kate McGonagle (U of M Survey Research Center)

Funding Agency   Note:

IRB   *HUM#:*   HUM00051456   *Period Of Approval:*   Approved w/Conting.

Project Team   *Project Lead:*   Shonda R Kruger-Ndiaye
Budget Analyst: William Lokers
Production Manager: Anthony Romanowski
Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager:
Production Manager:

Proposal #:   no data

Description: PSID-CE is the first web survey associated with the PSID. The sample for the study is comprised of virtually all PSID respondents and spouses and will include approximately 13,100 individuals. Potential respondents will be invited either to complete an on-line instrument or—in the case of those who have not reported Internet access at home—given the option to complete the instrument on-line or on paper. Follow-up efforts will consist of both hard-copy and e-mailed reminders as well as non-response calling. The interview content includes questions about childhood health conditions, socioeconomic status, neighborhood(s), friendships, school experiences, criminal activity as well as the parenting experienced as children. To help respondents accurately recall their ages when various events occurred, the on-line version of the questionnaire features a custom-built dynamic life history calendar. Due to the sensitivity of the content, a Certificate of Confidentiality will be obtained.

SRO Project Period   08/2013 - 11/2014
Data Col Period   05/2014 - 10/2014
Security Plan   Yes
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 08/01/2013	*Pretest Start:* 02/10/2014
Pretest End: 03/31/2014	*Recruitment Start:* 03/10/2014
Staffing Completed:	*GIT Start:*
SS Train Start:	*SS Train End:*
DC Start: 05/08/2014	*DC End:*

Other Project Team Members: Emily Blasczyk--Data Manager and Report Programmer
Hueichun Peng--Custom Project SMS Programmer
Donnalee Grey-Farquharson--Custom Project SMS Design/Specifications
Robert Fenton--Illume Programmer
Youhong Liu--Illume Programmer Consultant
Meredith House--Web Consultant
Becky Loomis & Gail Arnold--R Materials Assistance

Other Project Names: Family Economics Study Childhood Experiences Project
PSID Web/Mail

Sample Mgmt Sys   Web SMS
Data Col Tool   Illume; SAQ
Hardware   Laptop; Desktop; Paper and Pencil
DE Software   Illume
QC Recording Tool   N/A
Incentive   Yes, R
Administration   ISR Group (PSID)
Payment Type   Check, post ($20); Cash, prepaid ($0, $5 or $10 to End Game Rs (planned for early Oct 2014))
Payment Method   Check through other system (PSID's RAPS); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (PSID's RAPS)

Report Period   Apr, 2015 (PSID-CE (aka FES-CE))   **Project Phase**   Initiation

Risk Level   *Not Rated*

Monthly Update   No update information available on April activities.

Special Issues

Cost
May 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	0.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	0.00
Total Budget:	641,484.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	0.00
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
May 31, 2015

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

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Social Relations, Aging and Health: Competing Theories and Emerging Complexities, Wave 3 (SRS W3)
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone Secondary: Web Total of Modes: 2
Project Type	Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current
Budget	***Direct Budget:*** 950,999.00 ***InDirect Budget:*** 527,805.00 ***Total Budget:*** 1,478,804.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Toni Antonucci (SRC) Kira Birditt (SRC)
Funding Agency	National Institute of Health
IRB	***HUM#:*** 00074983 ***Period Of Approval:*** Exp3-11-15
Project Team	***Project Lead:*** Esther H Ullman ***Budget Analyst:*** Bethany Benton ***Production Manager:*** Joseph Matthew Matuzak ***Senior Project Advisor:*** Kirsten Haakan Alcser ***Production Manager:*** Maryam N Buageila ***Production Manager:***
Proposal #:	no data
Description:	SRO's work on this project will include the conduct of centralized telephone interviews with panel respondents and identified members of their 'core network'. After completing their centralized telephone interview, all respondents (both panel respondents and core network members) will be asked to complete monthly web-based journals for twelve months to demonstrate instances where they have relied on their "core network" to assist in dealing with life course events that they have faced, or in the case of core network members (CNMs) instances where they have provided support to the panel respondents in dealing with life course events that they have faced. The sample for the panel respondents will include the surviving members of the 1993 adult and child Social Relations cohorts (panel).
SRO Project Period	01/2014 - 01/2017
Data Col Period	07/2014 - 10/2016
Security Plan	Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	***Pretest Start:***
Pretest End:	***Recruitment Start:***
Staffing Completed:	***GIT Start:***
SS Train Start: 06/24/2014	***SS Train End:*** 06/25/2014
DC Start: 07/13/2014	***DC End:***

Other Project Team Members:	Rebecca Loomis, Dave Dybicki, Dan Zahs, Hueichun Peng, Max Malhortra, Minako Edgar, Robert Fenton, Shaowei Sun
Other Project Names:	Social Relations 2014
Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS; Web SMS; Illume; Project specific system (WebSMS)
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8
Hardware	Laptop; Desktop
DE Software	Illume
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI
Incentive	Yes, R
Administration	SRO Group
Payment Type	Check, post ($25,$20, $5-$95)
Payment Method	Check through other system

- -

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (SRS W3) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level	*Some Concerns*
Monthly Update	In April the mix of LCD leads, FTF tracking, the grid system of delivering numbers and the increased incentive led to an increase in panel cases completed. Meetings were held with LCD staff to review options going forward to maximize panel completion within budget.
Special Issues	

Cost
Apr 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	854,453.81
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	1,214,668.79
Total Budget:	1,478,804.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	-9,293.21
Reason For Variance:	This variance includes the costs that will be paid by SRO for errors.

Projections
Apr 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	63,802.60
Actual Dollars Used:	92,646.66
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-9,632.34
Reason For Variance:	Costs were higher than projections in February due to SSL- TL overrun in hours.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1046		5.5
Goal at Completion:	1030	.75	5.2
Current actual:	880	.48	3.9
Estimate at Complete:	1030	.55	
Variance:			

Other Measures

we are also collecting monthly web surveys. PI has also said Panel interviews are top priority (above CNM and web)

Project Name	Sustainability Cultural Indicators Program-2014 (SCIP-2014)
Project Mode	Primary: Web Total of Modes: 1

Project Type	Sponsored Projects	**Project Status**	Current

Budget	*Direct Budget:* 69,329.00	*InDirect Budget:* 0.00	*Total Budget:* 69,329.00

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

Funding Agency U-M Office of the Provost, with additional funding from the Graham Sustainability Institute and the Institute for Social Research

IRB *HUM#:* 00068573 *Period Of Approval:* 9/27/2013-9/26/2014

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

Proposal #: no data

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

SRO Project Period 07/2014 - 06/2015
Data Col Period 10/2014 - 11/2014
Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

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

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

Other Project Names: Campus Sustainability

Sample Mgmt Sys Illume
Data Col Tool Illume
Hardware NA
DE Software N/A
QC Recording Tool N/A
Incentive Yes, Other (A portion of R's (a raffle))
   Administration SRO Group
   Payment Type Other (Amazon gift code)
   Payment Method Other (Amazon gift code sent via e-mail)

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (SCIP-2014)	**Project Phase**	Closing

Risk Level *On Track*

Monthly Update
July '14
1. The regular meeting continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Qiaoxian, Will and Minako). The meetings mainly focus on analysis of 2013 data for the final report (including the first analysis of the panel). Focus will shift in August to the changes for the 2014 survey.

2.   A small group (Andrew Hupp, Mick Couper, James Wagner, and Gregg Peterson) was assembled to discuss the non-response issue in the 2013 SCIP. A list of possible ideas was generated to address the problem. A non-response proposal was submitted to the PIs for their review. They agreed with the proposal to have the PSM graduate student working for the project staff conduct a non-response analysis of the data we have (survey data, sample frame data and paradata. James will direct the analysis. Once the analysis has been completed a set of recommendations for the 2014 survey will be presented to the PIs.

3. Cheryl provided the contact information/process for obtaining the fac/staff sample from HR and the student sample from the Registrar.

4. Andrew provided formatted electronic copies of the 2012 and 2013 surveys to the PIs (rather than the Illume output previously provided as the questionnaire). Andrew provided an additional 2013 versions with comments on items that should be tweaked for the 2014 survey. These documents will be used as the basis for the 2014 questionnaires. These documents can be edited and submitted to the IRB as the 2014 versions.

5. Andrew provided information for the Continuing Review. Work will begin on the amendment for the 2014 survey in August.

August '14

1. The regular meeting continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Qiaoxian, Will and Minako). The meetings mainly focus on analysis. Most of the meetings for the month were cancelled due to schedules. There was a meeting that focused on changes for the 2014 survey. These include questionnaire changes from the stakeholders as well as design issues Andrew noted when reviewing the questionnaire, updates based on the non-response analysis as well as some restructuring of the end of the survey (location of submit button and flow into a survey where comments can be left).

2.   James and Andrew met with Qiaoxian to discuss the non-response analysis before Andrew went on vacation. While Andrew was on vacation Qiaoxian received a job offer and was not able to conduct the non-response analysis. Andrew met with Will (an incoming PSM student who works on the project) after Andrew's vacation to discuss the non-response analysis. He will begin work on this at the end of August. He will meet with James and Andrew the first week of September.

3. Andrew contacted the Registrar about the variables they have that could potentially be provided as part of the 2014 sample frame of students.

4. Andrew reviewed/edited/revised text put together on the 2013 methodology (based on something Cheryl had written) for the 2013 report to the university.

5. The recording of the video with the softball coach was to take place in August. Due to the commitments of the film team with the football program the shooting has been delayed.

6. In September: (1)work will begin on the IRB amendment for the 2014 survey, (2) programming/structural changes will be made to the instruments and systems for the survey (a) questionnaire revisions, (b) restructuring of the end of the survey, (c) recommendations based on the non-response analysis, which could include revising the mobile stylesheet, implementing a way to know if e-mails were open, etc.), (3) the video with the softball coach will be recorded.

September '14

1. The regular meeting continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako). A new member (Noah Webster) has joined the group. Meetings generally focused on the preparation for the launch of the 2014 surveys in October. 2.   James and Andrew met with Will (who took over for Qiaoxian) to discuss the non-response analysis. He met with James and Andrew first week of September with some information from his analysis. One analysis looked at when cases responded. From this analysis we modified the timing of the reminder e-mails.

3. Andrew requested sample frame files from the Registrar (Freshman N=4,000, Sophomore N=3,000, Junior N=3,000, Senior N=3,000, Grad Student, N=1,500) and U-M HR (Faculty N=3,000, Staff N=2,000).

4. The message from the softball coach was recorded. Andrew and Bob attended the recording of the video.

5. Andrew modified the communications (e-mails) for the IRB amendment.

6. Andrew made the modifications to the fac/staff survey.

7. The IRB amendment was submitted and approved by Andrew and John.

8. Andrew met with Mick and Bob regarding a consent and video experiment and an analysis related to survey data and administrative data.

9. In October: (1)an IRB amendment for the 2014 survey will be submitted with minor revisions, (2) programming/structural changes will be made to the instruments and systems for the surveys (a) student questionnaire revisions, (b) revisions of paradata code based on suggestions from Mick as he looks at the 2012 data, (c) implementing a mobile stylesheet (d) implementing a way to know if e-mails were open, etc.), (d) revisions for the consent experiment, (3) testing of all instruments and integrated systems.

October '14

1. The regular meeting continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako).

2. The sample files were received from UM-HR and UM-Registrar (Freshman N=4,000, Sophomore N=3,000, Junior N=3,000, Senior N=3,000, Grad Student, N=1,500) and U-M HR (Faculty N=3,000, Staff N=2,000).

3. Minako created a master SampleID for everyone (going back to the beginning of the study) since one did not exist. The sample file was then de-duplicated across faculty/staff and students and cross-section students and panel

students. Replicates of ~100 were created for each of the groups.
4. Andrew created a sample release schedule for all of the replicates.
5. Robert made modfications to the mobile stylesheet and implement a menu for the consent experiment.
6. Larry prepared the video for use during the 3rd reminder.
7. Hueichun programmed a way to tell if e-mails are being opened. This provides more information in the event there is an issue like there was during the 2013 data collection.
8. Andrew conducted final testing on the instrument.
9. Data collection began with Release 1 (5 replicates).

November '14
1. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako).
2. A project review was conducted with SRO admin detailing the design changes made to the 2014 survey to address problems from the 2013 data collection.
3. Data collection was primarily done in the month of November. Most sample was released in October. Two releases, 8 and 9 (6,455 cases) occurred in November. Release 9 was the reserve release. After seeing how production was going Andrew met with the PIs and the decision was made to release those cases. The PIs preferred number of interviews over response rate.

To do:
1. Add master SampleID to prior years datasets.
2. Write 2014 methods report.
3. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
4. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.

December '14
1. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako).
2. Data collection officially closed on Monday December 1.
3. Dan Zahs was provided the information to create the weights. Dan is still working on the weights.
4. Andrew created a list of methodological analyses that need to be completed. This list will be added to as other items of analysis interests arise. Resources will be assigned to work with Andrew on these items. Minako will have some involvement along with Will.
5. Andrew provided the comments from the anonymous survey to the PIs.
6. Andrew and Minako provided the email addresses to Graham of those participants requesting more information.

To do:
1. Produce final dataset once weights have been created.
2. Add master SampleID to prior years datasets.
3. Write 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
4. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
5. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
6. Work on proposal for Campus Sustainability project in Brazil.

January '15
1. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako).
2. Dan Zahs finished the cross-section weights for faculty/staff and students. He still needs to create the weight for the panel cases.
3. Andrew add to the list of methodological analyses that need to be completed. This list will be added to as other items of analysis interests arise. Resources will be assigned to work with Andrew on these items. Minako will have some involvement along with Will.
4. Andrew finished selecting the raffle winners, ordered the gift codes from Amazon and contacted the winners.
5. Minako has provided raw cross-section datasets.
6. Andrew worked on the 2014 report.
7. Andrew met with Bob on proposal for Brazil survey. The proposal is due at the end of January.
8. Andrew created questionnaires (faculty/staff, student, panel) for the project website.
9. Andrew created questionnaires to use for the 2015 revisions.

To do:
1. Produce final dataset once weights have been created.
2. Add master SampleID to prior years datasets.
3. Continue writing 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
4. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
5. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
6. IRB continuing renewal (expires end of July '15)

February '15

Work has been minimal in February. Andrew and Minako have been busy with other projects. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako). Will is going to help Minako with some recoding due to her commitments on other projects. Andrew closed out the imprest cash account set-up for the 2014 survey.

To do:
1. Dan needs to create the panel weights.
2. Produce final datasets once all weights have been created and values recoded.
3. Add master SampleID to prior years datasets.
4. Continue writing 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
5. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
6. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
7. IRB continuing renewal (expires end of July '15)

March '14

Work has been minimal in March. Minako has been busy with other projects. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako). Will helped Minako with some recoding. Dan and Andrew met with the PIs about the issues around the panel weights. Dan has a plan for finishing at least a portion of the weights (there will be a series of weights for different groups dependent on the analysis (groups being used) being done. Minako added the SID created for every participant ever to the prior years datasets.

To do:
1. Dan needs to create the various panel weights.
2. Produce final datasets once all weights have been created and values recoded.
3. Continue writing 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
4. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
5. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
6. IRB continuing renewal (expires end of July '15)

April '14

Work has been minimal in April (staff time is freeing up towards the end of the month). Minako is going to begin working on maps from the 2014 data collection. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako). Dan's plan is to finish the panel weights the week of 4/20. Andrew met with Bob and Noah about a related proposal for a related study in Brazil. The three of them drafted a set of questions for the Brazil group and are planning a meeting to work through the design.

To do:
1. Dan needs to create the various panel weights.
2. Produce final datasets once all weights have been created and values recoded.
3. Continue writing 2014 methods report. This includes rewriting the previous years into a comprehensive report that has information on each of the years (with tables for comparisons) rather than a separate report each year.
4. Analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
5. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
6. IRB continuing renewal (expires end of July '15)

Special Issues

Cost
Apr 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	54,096.46
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	69,243.11
Total Budget:	69,329.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	85.89
Reason For Variance:	

Projections
Apr 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	6,059.48
Actual Dollars Used:	1,585.57
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	4,473.91
Reason For Variance:	The Data Manager and analyst had other project commitments. Time allocated for those tasks was not used. Unused time has been pushed forward to future months for data analysis.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	4,950	.22	
Goal at Completion:	4,950	.22	
Current actual:	6,378	.303	
Estimate at Complete:	6,378	.303	
Variance:	+1,428		

Other Measures

Project Name	Transitions from Preschool through High School: Family, Schools and Neighborhoods (CDS 2014)
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone Secondary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 3
Project Type	Sponsored Projects

	Project Status	Current

Budget   ***Direct Budget:***   4,416,693.00   ***InDirect Budget:***   2,450,668.00   ***Total Budget:***   6,867,361.00

Principal Investigator/Client	Narayan Sastry (University of Michigan Survey Research Center) Kate McGonagle (University of Michigan Survey Research Center)
Funding Agency	National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
IRB	***HUM#:*** HUM00075944 ***Period Of Approval:*** 2/6/2014 - 2/5/2015

Project Team

Project Lead:	Jennifer C Arrieta
Budget Analyst:	William Lokers
Production Manager:	Dianne G Casey
Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager:	Shonda R Kruger-Ndiaye
Production Manager:	Maryam N Buageila

Proposal #:   no data

Description: The Child Development Study is part of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) suite. The goal of the CDS is to gather comprehensive and nationally representative, longitudinal data about children and their families to study how social, economic, and other factors affect children's and adolescents' development. The original CDS followed a cohort of children in PSID families who were 0–12 years of age in 1997 through three waves of data collection and focused on understanding the socio-demographic, psychological, and economic aspects of childhood in an on-going nationally-representative longitudinal study of families. In 2014, all of the children in the original cohort have reached adulthood, and a new generation of children has replaced them in PSID families. The goal is to collect information in 2014 on all children aged 0–17 years in this new generation, shifting the orientation from a cohort study to one that obtains information on the childhood experiences of all children in PSID families, who will become primary respondents in the Core PSID when they form their own economically-independent households. These new data will support studies of health, development, and well-being in childhood; the relationship between children's characteristics and contemporaneous family decision-making and behavior; and the effects of childhood factors on subsequent social, demographic, economic, and health outcomes over the entire life course for these individuals as they are followed into the future as part of PSID. The sample will consist of approximately 6,400 children aged 0-17 and 3,500 primary caregivers.

Data collection will be conducted in a variety of modes (FTF, TEL, MAIL) and will include the following:
•   A cover screen interview with an adult member of the household, preferably the expected primary caregiver, other caregiver, or the PSID 2013 respondent, to identify the actual primary caregiver and children;
•   A telephone interview with the child's primary caregiver;
•   A telephone interview with each child in the family unit ages 12- 17;
•   An interactive voice response (IVR) administration of sensitive questions with each child ages 12-17;
•   An in-person interview with a sub-set of children ages 8-11;
•   Woodcock Johnson assessments with a sub-set of primary caregivers and children ages 3-17;
•   A weekday and weekend time diary about the primary caregiver's activities;
•   A weekday and a weekend time diary about each child's activities;
•   Height and weight measurements for each child ages 3-17;
•   Height, weight, and waist circumference measurements for the primary caregiver;
•   Collection of a saliva sample from the primary caregiver and from children ages 5-17;
•   School records and birth records linkage consent forms for the primary caregiver and each child ages 0-17;
and
•   Neighborhood and in-home interviewer observations with a sub-set of households.

SRO Project Period	03/2014 - 08/2015
Data Col Period	10/2014 - 04/2015
Security Plan	Yes
Milestone Dates	

PreProduction Start:	03/01/2014	***Pretest Start:***	07/24/2014
Pretest End:	08/14/2014	***Recruitment Start:***	06/01/2014
Staffing Completed:	09/08/2014	***GIT Start:***	10/15/2014
SS Train Start:	10/17/2014	***SS Train End:***	10/22/2014
DC Start:	10/27/2014	***DC End:***	04/26/2015

Other Project Team Members:	Jeff Smith/Louis Daher - Tech Team Leads
	Sara Freeland - Training Coordinator
	Youhong Liu/Peter Sparks/Karl Dinkleman- CAI Programmers
	Marsha Skoman/Holly Ackerman - Sample Management System Programmers
	Lingling Zhang/Brad Goodwin - Data Managers
	Genise Pattullo - Help Desk Supervisor
	Winter Freeman - Project Assistant
	Ryan Yoder - Instrument testing and instrument specs
	Jay Lin - Instrument testing
	Andrea Pierce - Help Desk
Other Project Names:	New Age Child Development Study, Child Development Supplement, CDS IV
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak; Other (Weblog, WebTrak)
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; SAQ
Hardware	Laptop; Desktop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil
DE Software	Other (PSID Study Staff developed system)
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Camtasia
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, INF
Administration	SRO Group; ISR Group (PSID Study Staff)
Payment Type	Check, post (between $5 and $180); Cash, post (between $5 and $180); Other (Money Order)
Payment Method	Check through other system (PSID Study Staff processes check and money order payments); Interviewer paym

---

Report Period	Apr, 2015 (CDS 2014)	**Project Phase**	Implementing

Risk Level   *Some Concerns*

Monthly Update

During the month of April, the project manager, PSID survey director, and CDS production manager joined weekly meetings with the CDS PIs to discuss production. Multiple reminder and end-game letters continued to be sent to respondents. Data collection wrapped up on 4/26/15.

Main Data Collection continued in April with 58 interviewers, 7 TLs, 2 PCs, 1 lead tracker , 2 assistant trackers, and 1 travel coordinator. Sharing of field staff with PSID worked well for both projects - interviewers were meeting and/or exceeding their weekly commitment on both projects. SSL staff staff continued working on PCG and saliva mailings, Additional Components follow-up, IVR follow-up, and time diary coding.

Final coding in SurveyTrak of the remaining non-final PCG and Child SIDs is being completed over the next couple weeks. Based on the criteria given for the PIs to code cases out as partial, the very tentative response rates for Blaise are Coverscreen (89% unweighted, 87% weighted), PCG (86%), Child (81%). There are approximately 60 SIDs that have done a portion of the Blaise iw but did not meet the initial criteria provided by the PIs. The PIs will review these cases to determine if they are eligible to be coded 1005 or if they should be coded out as non-iw.

Upcoming work includes prepping sample to be released to core, post-data collection efforts (time diary data entry, coding, special reports, inventory/boxing up of supplies, etc). PIs will be monitoring the impact of CDS on PSID participation over the next couple of months to assess if they will do some type of follow-up next fall for additional components.

Special Issues

- High response rate expectations despite significant R burden
- No clear definition of what constitutes a completed household so initial monitoring will be at the most granular level by component. The definition of completed household varies based on release to PSID Core decisions by PIs.
- Constraint on production end date due to Core 2015 launch
- Overlap with PSID Core (sample and staff)

Cost
Mar 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	4,586,372.07
Estimated Cost at Completion (E$AC):	5,977,101.64
Total Budget:	6,867,361.00
Variance (Budget minus E$AC):	890,259.35
Reason For Variance:	Smaller sample size than projected, workscope changes since budget approved, fewer actual programmer hours than budgeted, and hosting costs less than budgeted.

Projections
Mar 31, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	517,283.79
Actual Dollars Used:	458,931.36
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	58,352.43
Reason For Variance:	Hours for the month were over-projected by 103 hours. The remaining difference was due to non-salary projections being higher than actuals hit.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI	
Current Goal:				
Goal at Completion:	2881	93%	4.29	
Current actual:	2,854	89% unweighted	4.16	
Estimate at Complete:				
Variance:				

Other Measures

Coverscreen Interviews: 93% RR goal (listed in the chart above)

From those families who complete the coverscreen interview, the response rate goals by component are listed below:

PCG Blaise Interviews: 95% (tentative final RR is 86% RR)

Child Blaise Interviews: 92% (tentative final RR is 81% RR)

Birth Linkage Consents: 92% (current 35% RR)

School Linkage Consents: 92% (current 32% RR)

Saliva Collection: 85% (current 36%RR)

Child Time Diaries: 85% (current 40%)

IVR: SRO feels 50% RR is achievable although research indicates 30% RR is norm for IVR with adults in market research . PIs have indicated that they expect a 75% RR for IVR. (current is 59% RR)