

Survey Research Operations

Monthly Project Report

Sponsored Projects

June 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
(CAMS 2015) HRS 2015 Consumption and Activity Mail Study
(CogVal) HRS Cognitive Diagnosis Validation Study
(HRS Screening Initiatives) HRS Screening Initiatives
(Forgiveness2015) Humility, Forgiveness and Social Relations: Ethnic & Racial Comparison
(MTTS) Mathematics Teachers & Teaching 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
(YRS) Optimizing Youth Suicide Risk Screening and Triage In the Emergency Department
(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
(SCA 2015) Surveys of Consumer Attitudes
(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, psychological 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 End:

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start:

DC Start:

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start:

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

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 Cam, 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 June, 2015 (Army STARRS) **Project Phase** Closing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update In June, our last month of Year 6 funding for Army STARRS, project activities continued to be focused on analysis; user support; and work with biomarker data. We made some progress on the study methods reports for AAS and

NSS, and are preparing for release of survey data to ICPSR the end of this month. Below is a summary of June activities and issues.

1. Management

- a. Project management: We continue to plug away at the project documentation as time permits, with some success. Cost monitoring and staff support were ongoing throughout the month.
- b. Finance: Our May costs were \$163,493 total, which is an under-run of \$7,425 or 4% of our projected cost for the month. The under-run was due to fewer hours worked than projected for a variety of staff. We now are projecting a small surplus of \$669 (total). We expect to end the project with a small under-run at the close of Year 6.
- c. Contract: a revision to the PAF-R is still awaiting signature in the SRC Directors office. We will not be pursuing this any further since the project is ending this month.
- d. IRB: We have received approvals for the IRB modifications, naming James Wagner as UM PI. We are submitting one last annual renewal for the MRMC IRB protocol (for the Workplace Violence funding).

2. Issues being tracked:

- a. We have submitted most of the GWAS files to Emory University; are waiting for one set of files from Rutgers and will process and submit those when they arrive.
- b. 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 scope will be moved into STARRS LS and additional funding will be requested when decisions are made.
- c. We are awaiting PI assignments for the final project report to NIMH and the Army, which is due 30 September. This work will be moved into STARRS LS.

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 team continues to receive and process requests to add enclave users. We are working with HJF and the other PIs to ensure that we are clear on who should retain access to army STARRS data, and processing termination paperwork for those moving off the project as of June 30.

4. Analysis/publications: June activities include:

- a. Slides were prepared for a conference presentation and submitted to Michaelle Scanlon for review. The presentation is in August. The topic is the experiment on the timing of the mode switch and is based upon the paper that is currently under review.
- b. Work with paradata continues, developing measures of effort and response rates for subgroups of PPDS T3 panel members. This included, for example, looking at soldiers who were estimated to have separated from the Army before the T3 interview.

5. Analysis/publications: Most of the deliverables scheduled for June have been completed. A few will be finalized in early June. Staff absences and an increase in user requests at the end of the project year have resulted in some of this work being pushed down in the queue.

- a. Draft of second accidental death manuscript -completed
- b. AAS/PPDST0 analyses: replicate tables from the earlier paper by Matt Nock, using the full AAS dataset – in process
- c. PPDS longitudinal, analytic data set: - UM work complete, transferred to Harvard
- d. Weighting documents for AAS and NSS, AAS Quarter 1 weights: complete.
- e. Genetics sampling documents (for GWAS/weighting biomarker work/papers): in process
- 6. 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. This scope will be moved into STARRS LS.
 - a. NSS and AAS survey methodology reports are close to being finished.
 - b. The user guide for the combined AAS/PPDS analysis datafile needs to be updated for the AAS public use data only
 - c. Survey methodology reports for PPDS, other components: to be done
 - d. The Report of SRO Activities is being worked.
 - e. We have an outline for the final report to the Army; we expect to receive assignments for this report in the near future.

7. Public use data files: Below is an update sent to NIMH and the Army STARRS PI's from Steve, outlining the plans for release of NSS and AAS survey data.

- a. We will plan to go live on 1 July, 2015. On July 1st, we expect that the link to the public ICPSR catalogue site and from there to the application for restricted access to the AAS and NSS via the ICPSR Virtual Data Enclave (VDE) will be complete.
- b. The general public will be able to view the ICPSR User Guides for the AAS and NSS survey data on an ICPSR catalogue site. The scientific public will be able to access this catalogue site in several ways: 1) directly through a URL (we will circulate when the exact link has been established by ICPSR); 2) through a link that we will place on the Instruments and Data page on the Army STARRS website (www.armystarrs.org); or 3) indirectly by going to the ICPSR site, www.icpsr.umich.edu, and searching for a keyword such as "Army STARRS", "STARRS" etc.
- c. For interested researchers, the openly accessible ICPSR catalogue site will provide a range of metadata tools to help them decide whether to proceed with the application for restricted access to the actual AAS and NSS survey data. Examples of the metadata that will be openly available for review on this site include: 1) AAS and NSS survey

codebooks with basic frequencies/descriptive statistics for response categories/values; 2) .pdf copies of the .v4 version of the survey questionnaires; 3) analysts's guides that describe correct approaches to weighted analysis of the AAS and NSS survey data; 4) an example of the restricted access data use agreement. If after reviewing these metadata, a user decides that s(he) wishes to apply for restricted VDE access to the actual data, there will be a link to initiate the application process.

d. ICPSR will review all applications for restricted access to survey data on the ICPSR VDE. Approved users will be provided VDE access to the survey data subject to the terms and conditions in the ICPSR restricted access use agreement. Approved users will be expected to pay ICPSR a \$350 annual fee per user to maintain their account on the ICPSR VDE. In addition to access to the data, VDE users will have access to current versions of all major statistical analysis software packages (e.g. SAS, Stata, SPSS, R) to use in conducting analysis of the data.

e. As requested by the ODUSA, on a quarterly basis, ICPSR will provide a summary of approved applications (applicant name, affiliation and project summary) to designated scientists at the, Army, NIMH and USUHS. USUHS will coordinate who exactly will receive this summary. This will be information sharing only and is intended as a means to provide general awareness of the types of research that are being conducted with the Army STARRS public use data. It is not viewed as a step in the individual application review process that will be managed by ICPSR.

8. Data management activities: the team continues to respond to queries from users and receive, log and store data coming from the Army. We are adding a small number of staff hours to handle the transition and some spill-over of Year 6 scope into STARRS LS.

9. Related projects

a. Workplace violence: work continues, no issues.

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 work will be added to the STARRS LS when decisions are made.

We are awaiting PI assignments for the final project report to NIMH and the Army, which is due 30 September. This work will move to STARRS LS.

Cost Jun 12, 2015

There is still quite a bit of documentation left to do. This work will move into STARRS LS.

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	31,296,038.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	31,477,803.00
Total Budget:	31,478,471.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	668.00
Reason For Variance:	We anticipate completing this study with a small positive balance.

Projections Jun 12, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	170,919.00
Actual Dollars Used:	163,493.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	7,425.00
Reason For Variance:	Fewer hours were worked than projected.

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 from the All Army Study (AAS), New Soldier Study (NSS) and Pre-Post Deployment Study (PPDS) samples using a web-phone multi mode study. Each of the approximately 70,000 eligible respondents will be invited to participate once every two years. In addition to reinterviewing the AAS, NSS and PPDS samples; STARRS LS will continue to maintain and support the Research Data Enclave, allowing members of the research team and collaborators to analyze primary Army STARRS data as well as de-identified historical administrative data received from the Army and Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, STARRS LS will continue to receive and link de-identified administrative data to the survey data (from the original Army STARRS data collection as well as STARRS LS surveys). These data will also be made available in the Research Data Enclave.

SRO Project Period 02/2015 - 11/2019

Data Col Period 10/2015 - 11/2019

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 02/01/2015

Pretest End: 12/31/2015

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start:

DC Start: 02/01/2016

Pretest Start: 10/01/2015

Recruitment Start:

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

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 June, 2015 (A-STARRS LS)

Project Phase Planning

Risk Level Some Concerns

Monthly Update Project Planning:

- We continue to plan for the launch of our pilot in October and have started planning our staffing for main data collection which will start in February.
- We submitted the pilot data collection protocol to our IRB on June 22, which will be reviewed at the full board meeting July 16th. We expect to have approval by early August, and will forward the approved protocol to USUHS for

secondary IRB review and approval. We have received some revisions to the questionnaire which will be submitted in a new amendment as soon as we receive approval for the modification currently under review.

- We are continuing to meet with Harvard and plan for the proposed study for the Department of Veterans' Affairs, identifying soldiers who are scheduled to leave active duty and conducting pre- and post-separation interviews in conjunction with STARRS LS data collection.

Enclave and User Support:

- We have been preparing for the transition as Army STARRS Year 6 funding ends this month. We have added a small number of staff hours to the STARRS LS projections to finish processing and loading data from the recently completed biomarker analyses; and to continue to receive, check, and store the incoming Army/DoD quarterly administrative data files.
- We are working with UCSD, HJF and USUHS to clarify user access requirements and research team needs for work continuing under STARRS LS funding.

Financial Planning, Cost Monitoring

- We are preparing a revised five-year budget for STARRS LS based on the recently approved scope changes.
- The anticipated award from the VA will also require a revised budget when the scope and timeline are finalized.

Technical Systems Development, Programming

- We have begun programming the web questionnaire, and are working to modify the web version for phone mode. Optimizing the instrument for use with mobile devices will not be ready in time for the October pilot.
- We are developing additional modules in our new sample management system (MSMS) that will be needed for STARRS LS. We are specifying the contact and tracking protocols, as well as reports to be used for the pilot.
- We are testing the integration between the new version of Blaise (Blaise 5) and the MSMS sample management system. We have found some bugs, and are working closely with Statistics Netherlands to correct the problems. We are expecting a new release of Blaise 5 the end of June.

Cost Report:

Our estimate of current costs, and a preliminary cost-to-complete projection for Year 1 is shown in Table 1 below. This month we have separated the projected costs for maintenance and support of the Research Data Enclave from costs for our project management and data collection activities.

Table 1: STARRS LS Cost Report for May 2015

Component	Data Collection + Project Management		Enclave and User Support		STARRS LS Total Project	
Year 1 Budget*	\$824,120	\$245,783	\$1,069,903			
Year 1 Costs through April 2015		\$57,053	\$0	\$57,053		
Costs for Current Month (May 2015)		\$24,360	\$0	\$24,360		
Costs to Date	\$81,413	\$0	\$81,413			
Year 1 Projections (June-Nov 2015)	\$814,318	\$258,400	\$1,072,718			
Total Year 1 Projected Cost	\$895,731	\$258,400	\$1,154,131			
Variance (Budget-Total)	-\$71,611	-\$12,617	-\$84,228			

*February 2015 budget. Budget revisions are in process to incorporate added scope.

Cost Explanation:

Our costs for May 2015 continue to be modest, reflecting the small number of staff working on STARRS LS, and the fact that Enclave costs are covered by Year 6 funds. Our costs will continue increase in the coming months, as we ramp up our activities in preparation for the start of the October pilot study. We will have an increase in our costs in July when the costs for the Enclave and user support are moved to the STARRS LS account.

We are showing an over-run of \$84,228 (7.9%) for Year 1. The majority of the over-run is due to new scope transferred from Harvard and USUHS. We are working on revising our cost estimates and will include the new budget figures in these tables as soon as they have been finalized and approved. We have added a few staff hours for our Enclave team to continue to receive, check and store the administrative data until that work is taken over by AAG, to finish up loading biomarker results and data transfers, and to process additional user access requests.

Special Issues**Areas of Risk, Mitigation Strategies:**

We continue to track several areas of risk, and develop mitigation strategies.

- Locating respondents, and response rate. Our contact information (particularly for AAS and NSS) is limited and outdated. The Army address updates are helpful, but they provide only military addresses. In addition, we know from PPDS Time 3 and other studies that contact rates are declining, with more individuals choosing to not answer phone calls. We are working to set up our calling and tracking protocols (including using email, text message and letting contact persons know we are trying to reach the participants) to maximize our contact and completion rates. We are also asking Harvard to identify cases with the greatest analytic interest, so we can focus our location activities on high priority cases.
- New technical systems. We still have a substantial amount of development and testing left to do before we launch the pilot. We are monitoring progress, and working with the technical teams to prioritize the development to ensure that the most important pieces are finished first. It is likely that we will use a "beta" version for the pilot, with development continuing through 2015 to get us ready for a February 2016 production launch.
- Questionnaire length. The questionnaire is very lengthy. This will result in additional programming and testing time, and also may increase the number of partial interviews as respondents start but do not finish the interview. We will monitor this during the pilot and work with Harvard to implement adjustments as necessary.

Cost
Jun 10, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 81,413.00
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 need to revise the budget to accommodate added scope. That will be done in July.

Projections
Jun 10, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month: 0.00
Actual Dollars Used: 24,360.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00
Reason For Variance: We have not yet set up monthly projections report, will get that done next month.

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												
Project Mode	(Biobanks) 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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>												
SRO Project Period	09/2013 - 06/2016												
Data Col Period	01/2015 - 12/2015												
Security Plan	NA												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 10/05/2014</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start: 01/05/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End: 02/23/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 12/03/2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 12/03/2014</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 01/05/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 12/15/2014</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 12/20/2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 01/05/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End: 10/15/2015</td> </tr> </table>			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
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	June, 2015 (Biobanks)	Project Phase	Initiation
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	------------

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

Monthly Update	No update information provided on June activities.
-----------------------	----------------------------------------------------

Special Issues

Cost	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	178,851.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
	<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

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

Other Measures

Project Name	HRS 2015 Consumption and Activity Mail Study (CAMS 2015)																								
Project Mode	Primary: Mail Total of Modes: 1																								
Project Type	Sponsored Projects			Project Status	Current																				
Budget	Direct Budget:	305,700.00	Indirect Budget:	110,052.00	Total Budget: 415,752.00																				
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (SRC) Mary Beth Ofstedal (SRC)																								
Funding Agency	National Institute on Aging (NIA)																								
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00079949	Period Of Approval:	8/28/2015-8/27/2015																					
Project Team	Project Lead:	Jennifer C Arrieta																							
	Budget Analyst:	Richard Warren Krause																							
	Production Manager:																								
	Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher																							
	Production Manager:																								
	Production Manager:																								
Proposal #:	no data																								
Description:	CAMS is part of the Health and Retirement Study (HRS). The goal of CAMS is to gather additional data on household consumption and activities of daily living from participants in the HRS. In 2015, a paper questionnaire will be mailed to approximately 8,784 respondents of which 6,000 will receive the full questionnaire and 2,784 spouse/partners will receive a brief questionnaire.																								
SRO Project Period	06/2015 - 02/2016																								
Data Col Period	09/2015 - 01/2016																								
Security Plan	Yes																								
Milestone Dates	<table><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</td><td>06/01/2015</td><td>Pretest Start:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Pretest End:</td><td></td><td>Recruitment Start:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Staffing Completed:</td><td></td><td>GIT Start:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>SS Train Start:</td><td></td><td>SS Train End:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>DC Start:</td><td>09/16/2015</td><td>DC End:</td><td>01/31/2016</td></tr></table>					PreProduction Start:	06/01/2015	Pretest Start:		Pretest End:		Recruitment Start:		Staffing Completed:		GIT Start:		SS Train Start:		SS Train End:		DC Start:	09/16/2015	DC End:	01/31/2016
PreProduction Start:	06/01/2015	Pretest Start:																							
Pretest End:		Recruitment Start:																							
Staffing Completed:		GIT Start:																							
SS Train Start:		SS Train End:																							
DC Start:	09/16/2015	DC End:	01/31/2016																						
Other Project Team Members:	Data Manager: Joel Devonshire Project Assistant: Jeannie Baker Programmer: Holly Ackerman Assembly Coordinator: Vicki Wagner																								
Other Project Names:	CAMS																								
Sample Mgmt Sys	Other (Weblog)																								
Data Col Tool	SAQ																								
Hardware	Paper and Pencil																								
DE Software	Other (HRS study staff is responsible for data entry)																								
QC Recording Tool	N/A																								
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (spouse)																								
Administration	SRO Group																								
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (\$25 to main R and \$10 to spouse R)																								
Payment Method	Check through STRak RPav System																								

Report Period	June, 2015 (CAMS 2015)	Project Phase	Planning
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	CAMS preproduction activities began in June. The budget and projections were set up in CRS, project management plan, schedule, and charter were developed, respondent contact materials were drafted and translated, technical specs were updated and weblog programming started.		
Special Issues	Large sample size presents a challenge for finding space and staff resources for assembly and logging.		

Cost
May 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 0.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 413,020.23
Total Budget: 415,752.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 2,731.77
Reason For Variance: Based on initial projections entered into CRS.

Projections
May 31, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month: 0.00
Actual Dollars Used: 0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00
Reason For Variance: Work began in June 2015.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i>	6,149	70%	
<i>Goal at Completion:</i>			
<i>Current actual:</i>			
<i>Estimate at Complete:</i>			
<i>Variance:</i>			

Other Measures

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:	334,652.00	Indirect Budget:	120,475.00 Total Budget: 455,127.00		
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	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:					
Other Project Team Members:	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	June, 2015 (CogVal)	Project Phase	Initiation
Risk Level	Not Rated		
Monthly Update	No update information provided on June activities.		
Special Issues			

Cost	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	455,127.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
	<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

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

Other Measures

Project Name	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 Kwaizer		
	Production Manager:			
Proposal #:	no data			
Description:	<p>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.</p> <p>The following were all conducted under this project's budget in order to design the optimal 2016 screening methods:</p> <p>(1) A detailed analysis of the HRS 2010-11 screening results</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(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,</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
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 End:****Staffing Completed:****SS Train Start:** 08/20/2013**DC Start:** 08/22/2013**Pretest Start:****Recruitment Start:****GIT Start:****SS Train End:** 08/21/2013**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 Blasczyk, Marsha Skoman, Holly Ackerman, Deb Wilson, Heather Reijto, Jamie Koopman, Rick Krause, Daniel Guzman, Paul Burton, Kyle Kwaiser, Ann Vernier, Heather Reijto

Other Project

Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys

SurveyTrak; Other (Weblog for LBB/EGENX mailings)

Data Col Tool

Blaise 4.8

Hardware

Laptop; Tablet; [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

June, 2015 (HRS Screening Initiatives)

Project Phase

Initiation

Risk Level

Not Rated

Monthly Update

No update information provided on June activities.

Special Issues

Cost

Jul 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

Jul 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	Humility, Forgiveness and Social Relations: Ethnic & Racial Comparison (Forgiveness2015)				
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current	
Budget	Direct Budget:	445,806.00	Indirect Budget:	66,870.00	Total Budget: 512,676.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Toni Antonucci (Life Course Development Program - SRC) Kristine Ajrouch (Life Course Development Program - SRC) Kira Birditt & Noah Webster (Life Course Development Program - SRC)				
Funding Agency	Templeton Foundation				
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00099310	Period Of Approval:	thru 3/3/2016	
Project Team	Project Lead:	Cheryl Wiese			
	Budget Analyst:	Christine Evanchek			
	Production Manager:	Ruth B Philippou			
	Senior Project Advisor:	Jody Dougherty			
	Production Manager:	Production Manager:			
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>Humility and forgiveness represent two key temperance virtues that have significant implications for well-being on an individual and societal level. Both can inform individuals' understanding of their own lives, how they interpret the actions of others, and their willingness to work for a better society. Each signify personal characteristics, yet develop through social relationships. We propose that social networks are centrally important for character development in that they constitute the circle of significant others through which efficacy emerges, support is received and overall trust is generated. We argue these may work as key pathways through which social networks lead to the development of humility and forgiveness, and ultimately well-being. Yet, there is little population-level empirical data exploring the direct and indirect ways in which social networks influence the character virtues of humility and forgiveness and whether this process varies by ethnicity or race.</p> <p>We propose an innovative approach to survey racially and ethnically diverse adults from the Detroit metropolitan area. The method includes an experimental component that will test hypothesized pathways through which individuals acquire the virtues of humility and forgiveness as well as a dyadic component. Expected outputs include a data archive, scientific presentations and publications, as well as media and practitioner outreach. Anticipated outcomes include creating a new focus within social relations research that links to character development and well-being across the life span. One of our goals is to create a focus on the virtues of humility and forgiveness in media discourse. We also hope to stimulate practice and program initiatives that enhance character development through social relations. Finally, we envision this work being expanded internationally in an effort to foster humility, forgiveness and peace world-wide.</p> <p>The present proposal builds upon recent scientific developments in the field of social relations, and benefits from ongoing advances in the areas of humility and forgiveness. We target humility and forgiveness because they are uniquely associated with positive group relations as well as better health and well-being. We hypothesize that humility and forgiveness are essential not only for interactions between social partners, but extend to interactions between ethnic and racial groups.</p> <p>We propose to examine humility and forgiveness among three groups prominent in the metro-Detroit area: Black Americans (300), Arab Americans (300), and Non-Hispanic White Americans (300) using survey and experimental data to address the following questions:</p> <p>1) How do social networks influence the virtues of humility and forgiveness? 2) Do social networks influence well-being via humility and forgiveness? 3) Do links among social relations, humility/forgiveness and well-being vary by ethnicity/race? 4) Do patterns of social relations, humility, and forgiveness predict acceptance and/or discrimination between ethnic groups?</p> <p>The experimental component is intended to identify causal pathways in survey findings. Inclusion of dyadic data (100 spouses within each racial group) will furthermore provide a unique opportunity for in-depth examination of relational dimensions of humility and forgiveness. Deliverables include a data archive, scientific dissemination, as well as media and practitioner outreach. We envision this work as providing important insights into how individuals develop humility and forgiveness in the context of their social relations.</p>				
SRO Project Period	04/2015 - 12/2014				
Data Col Period	07/2015 - 11/2015				
Security Plan	NA				

Milestone Dates**PreProduction Start:****Pretest End:****Staffing Completed:****SS Train Start:****DC Start:****Pretest Start:****Recruitment Start:****GIT Start:****SS Train End:****DC End:****Other Project****Team Members:**

Project Team:

Ruth Philippou, Production Manager

Admin Asst/Prod Asst TBD

Dan Zahs, Statistician

Tech Lead TBD

Paul Schulz, Research Associate Stats

Julie de Jong, Consultant

Dave Dybicki, Programmer

Chrissy Evanchek, Budget Analyst

Emily Blasczyk, Data Manager

Jody Dougherty, Senior Project Advisor

25 interviewers, 4 TLs

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**

June, 2015 (Forgiveness2015)

Project Phase

Initiation

Risk Level

Not Rated

Monthly Update

No update information provided on June activities.

Special Issues**Cost**

Jul 31, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):

0.00

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):

0.00

Total Budget:

512,676.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):

0.00

Reason For Variance:**Projections**

Jul 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:	<p>For the last 25 years, three major goals have animated the U.S. mathematics education community: the need for more knowledgeable teachers, more challenging curricula for students, and more ambitious instruction in classrooms. And yet despite volumes of policy guidance, on-the-ground effort and research over the past decades, few comprehensive and representative portraits of teacher and teaching quality in U.S. mathematics classrooms exist. Instead, most research into these topics has been conducted with small samples or non-representative samples (e.g., Kane & Staiger, 2012), with the result that it is difficult to ascertain what, if any, progress has been made toward the three goals. To provide information on such progress, we will collect data on teacher content knowledge, curriculum use, and instruction from a nationally representative sample of U.S. middle school mathematics teachers. A written survey will build on a similar study conducted in 2005 – 06 (Hill, 2007), allowing for the comparison of teachers' curriculum use and content knowledge – and more specifically, their mathematical knowledge for teaching (MKT) –across time periods. An observational component will record and score videotapes of instruction, allowing for a description of current instruction as well as a comparison of current instruction to that observed during the TIMSS video study (Heibert et al., 2005). The new video dataset will also serve as a baseline for future studies of instruction, for instance ones comparing current instruction to that in 2025, to assess whether Common Core State Standards have been met.</p>				
SRO Project Period	09/2014 - 06/2016				
Data Col Period	01/2015 - 12/2015				
Security Plan	NA				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: 10/01/2014 Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 03/02/2015 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: 01/26/2015 GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 03/31/2016 </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: 10/01/2014 Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 03/02/2015	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: 01/26/2015 GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 03/31/2016
PreProduction Start: 10/01/2014 Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 03/02/2015	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: 01/26/2015 GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 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****Data Col Tool****Hardware****DE Software****QC Recording Tool****Incentive****Administration****Payment Type****Payment Method**

SMS; Project specific system (SRIS)

SAQ; Other (video recorded on tablet)

Desktop; Tablet; Other (Tablets, Swivls, Tripods provided by research team)

Blaise 4.8 BIA

N/A

NA

NA

Check, post (\$50 for SAQ, \$200 video); Cash, prepaid (5)

Check through other system (ISR Business Office); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (ISR Business

Report Period

June, 2015 (MTTS)

Project Phase

Implementing

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

During June, 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 May 2015 monthly report.

Task 2: Sampling

- Reviewed weekly sampling reports
- Provided replacement schools as needed for district-level research applications

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Developed data entry program for the post-lesson log

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Data Management
 - o Loaded test data into developmental pages as needed.
 - o Developed MQI consent report
 - o Automated weekly production reports
- SRIS Development
 - o Held weekly meetings with SRO technical team to discuss and elaborate various elements of SRIS design.
 - o Updated IRB page in SRIS – added additional variables to track respondent payment requirements
 - o Made minor modifications to equipment logging page and teacher pages in SRIS. Tested and placed pages into production.
 - o Continued testing of email handler. Automated thank you and reminder letters.

Task 6: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring

Task 7: Training

Task 8: Main Data Collection

- District Recruitment –Research Applications
 - o Prepared and submitted research applications for 14 districts.
 - o Responded to questions and requests for protocol updates from districts.
- Rostering
 - o No activity.
- MKT Production
 - o Logged eight (8) incoming MKTs.
 - o Mailed respondent payments to MKT responders.. Payments included a note regarding video-recording in the Fall.
- MQI Production
 - o Received and logged videos from two teachers.
 - o Process and mailed respondent payments.

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 5/31/2015	\$ 395,561
Expected cost at complete:	\$ 1,218,625
Expected Variance:	\$ 11,603

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. There is uncertainty regarding the total effort that will be needed to recruit districts, schools and teachers. 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, addition of district recruitment replicate, 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, 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 a large number of the district-level IRB applications, and will gather necessary district-level academic schedules as needed. The effort to complete IRB applications is substantial, and is being shared with Harvard. 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
Jun 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	395,561.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,218,625.00
Total Budget:	1,230,225.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	111,603.00

Reason For Variance:

The projected variance anticipates a possible underrun due to anticipated SRO work scope decreases, however there is uncertainty in these projections. There is uncertainty regarding the total effort that will be needed to recruit districts, schools and teachers. 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.

Projections
Jun 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:

105,205.00

Actual Dollars Used:

53,744.00

Variance (Projected minus Actual):

51,461.00

Reason For Variance:

District recruitment was excessively slow, as was school rostering and teacher participation. Teacher response rates were well below budgeted rates (33% versus 60%), leading to underruns in all non-labor categories.

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot (MTF-WPSP Year 2)					
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:	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Deliverables include the programmed Web Surveys, Data Dictionary, Test Dataset, Documentation of the Instruments, and Survey datasets</p> <p>SRO involvement will commence in the Fall of 2012 and will continue through April of 2017.</p> <p>Monitoring budget against the budget for the first two years 2012 - 2014</p>					
SRO Project Period	08/2012 - 08/2015					
Data Col Period	04/2014 - 08/2014					
Security Plan	Yes					
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:					
Other Project Team Members:	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 June, 2015 (MTF-WPSP Year 2) **Project Phase** Initiation

Risk Level *Not Rated*

Monthly Update No update information provided on June activities.

Special Issues

Cost

Jul 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

Jul 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
<i>Current Goal:</i> <i>Goal at Completion:</i> <i>Current actual:</i> <i>Estimate at Complete:</i> <i>Variance:</i>		

Other Measures

Project Name	National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG 2010-2020)													
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1													
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget:	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:	<p>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.</p>													
SRO Project Period	09/2010 - 07/2020													
Data Col Period	09/2011 - 06/2019													
Security Plan	Yes													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 09/13/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 09/15/2011</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 09/19/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 09/20/2011</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End: 07/01/2019</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011	Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011	GIT Start: 09/13/2011	SS Train Start: 09/15/2011	SS Train End: 09/19/2011	DC Start: 09/20/2011	DC End: 07/01/2019
PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011	Pretest Start:													
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011													
Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011	GIT Start: 09/13/2011													
SS Train Start: 09/15/2011	SS Train End: 09/19/2011													
DC Start: 09/20/2011	DC End: 07/01/2019													
Other Project Team Members:	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst, 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	June, 2015 (NSFG 2010-2020)	Project Phase	Initiation
Risk Level	Not Rated		
Monthly Update	No update information provided on June activities.		
Special Issues			

Cost	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	40,153,203.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
	<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

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

Other Measures

Project Name	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:	<p>During early adolescence systems in the brain that are characterized by heightened reactivity to motivational stimuli and rewards mature rapidly, while systems that enable more effective cognitive control and judgment mature more slowly. This "developmental maturity mismatch" has been proposed as a key contributor to health risk behavior among adolescents, which is of critical importance because: (1) risk behaviors are the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in this age group, including diseases arising from unprotected sexual activity and casualties arising from reckless behavior (including driving fatalities and serious injuries); (2) it is the peak age for the onset of a wide range of risk behavior patterns with potential long-term consequences, including substance use and abuse, and delinquency. The "developmental maturity mismatch" hypothesis, however, has not been directly tested in relation to risk behavior at a level sufficient to inform this critical health area. The primary aim of the ANDH study is to understand the behavioral, cognitive, and neural bases of risk taking, through integrated analyses of age differences, developmental trajectories, and individual differences in psychosocial, neurocognitive and neural imaging assessments.</p> <p>The study will involve data collection from 10th and 12th grade students (~2000 students total) in 7-8 local high schools (approximately 150 students from each age group per school), with group administration in the schools using laptops in a baseline data collection to be completed over a 3-month period in the fall of 2014. Each respondent will attend 2 ~45 minute sessions: one survey and one neurocognitive tests. After the baseline data collection, SRO will modify the survey questionnaire to operate as a web-based survey, and will administer the web survey to all 2,000 respondents in years 2, 3, and 4 of the project (in the fall of 2015, 2016 and 2017). A small number of respondents (150-160) will be sub-selected to undergo neural imaging at U-M facilities in Ann Arbor (SRO will not be directly involved in this portion of the study).</p>												
SRO Project Period	04/2014 - 03/2018												
Data Col Period	03/2015 - 06/2015												
Security Plan	Yes												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 08/01/2014</td> <td>Pretest Start: 11/10/2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End: 11/13/2014</td> <td>Recruitment Start: 02/02/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed: 01/23/2015</td> <td>GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start: 02/25/2015</td> <td>SS Train End: 02/26/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 03/02/2015</td> <td>DC End: 10/31/2015</td> </tr> </table>			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: 10/31/2015
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: 10/31/2015												
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 June, 2015 (AHRB) **Project Phase** Implementing
Risk Level On Track
Monthly Update Activity level was very low in June. We -
 - handled a few questions from the researchers
 - received IRB approval for the amendment to gain contact information for the UM undergraduate psychology subject pool participants of the pilot
 - did some analysis of the survey time-outs
 - estimated and began work on paradata processing
Special Issues The extension of wave 1 data collection into fall has been approved by the PI.
Cost
Jun 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	587,448.26
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,257,601.65
Total Budget:	1,082,053.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-175,548.65
Reason For Variance:	Projections updated to reflect the extension of data collection into the fall 2015, which has been approved by PI. Additional funds will be transferred in June.

Projections
Jun 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	45,509.92
Actual Dollars Used:	43,860.43
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	1,649.49
Reason For Variance:	

Measures	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	2,000		
Goal at Completion:	2,000		
Current actual:	469		
Estimate at Complete:	1,500		
Variance:			

Other Measures

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

Project Mode Primary: Telephone Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

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

Funding Agency

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

SRO Project Period 03/2015 - 12/2017

Data Col Period 07/2015 - 07/2017

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

<i>PreProduction Start:</i>	<i>Pretest Start:</i>
<i>Pretest End:</i>	<i>Recruitment Start:</i>
<i>Staffing Completed:</i>	<i>GIT Start:</i>
<i>SS Train Start:</i>	<i>SS Train End:</i>
<i>DC Start:</i>	<i>DC End:</i>

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 June, 2015 (YRS) **Project Phase** Planning

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update Project Review was held in early June. Technical team has been working on Blaise specs, report specs, webtrak specs, safety protocol plan

Special Issues**Cost**

Jun 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 57,900.90
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 1,315,423.56
Total Budget: 1,423,227.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 32,593.44
Reason For Variance: Early in development phase so not all costs known yet. Will be providing PI estimate of cost to conduct a parent interview in Spanish to 5% of sample

Projections

Jun 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month: 25,895.89
Actual Dollars Used: 23,164.02
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 2,731.87
Reason For Variance: Team is now starting pre-production activities since we finally received the logic for safety protocol- specs not yet ready for programmer

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	2000	85%	3.0
Goal at Completion:	2000	85%	3.0
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

There will actually be two surveys in phase 1 (at 3 months and 6 months)...and then a second phase survey. Each has their own RR expected

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	<table><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</td><td>08/01/2013</td><td>Pretest Start:</td><td>02/10/2014</td></tr><tr><td>Pretest End:</td><td>03/31/2014</td><td>Recruitment Start:</td><td>03/10/2014</td></tr><tr><td>Staffing Completed:</td><td></td><td>GIT Start:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>SS Train Start:</td><td></td><td>SS Train End:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>DC Start:</td><td>05/08/2014</td><td>DC End:</td><td></td></tr></table>					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:	
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 Family Economics Study Childhood Experiences Project PSID Web/Mail																								
Other Project Names:	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	June, 2015 (PSID-CE (aka FES-CE))	Project Phase	Initiation
Risk Level	Not Rated		
Monthly Update	No update information provided on June activities.		

Special Issues

Cost	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	641,484.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
Jul 31, 2015	<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
	<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Social 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:	<p>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).</p>				
SRO Project Period	01/2014 - 01/2017				
Data Col Period	07/2014 - 10/2016				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 06/24/2014 DC Start: 07/13/2014 </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 06/25/2014 DC End: </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 06/24/2014 DC Start: 07/13/2014	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 06/25/2014 DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: 06/24/2014 DC Start: 07/13/2014	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 06/25/2014 DC End:				
Other Project Team Members:	Rebecca Loomis, Dave Dybicki, Dan Zabs, 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	June, 2015 (SRS W3)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	<p>In June discussions were held between SRO and LCD staff to determine final end date for project (whether or not to extend the web journals to July 2016) and how the projected overrun would be covered. Progress has been made and a memo has been sent to confirm the shared plan to cover costs. This plan has the web surveys continuing to Dec 2015.</p>		
Special Issues	Continued difficulty in getting the client to identify aspects of study to trim to live within the budget constraints of 18% cut.		

Cost
Jun 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 1,033,360.48
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 1,245,460.84
Total Budget: 1,478,804.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -40,085.26
Reason For Variance: This variance includes the costs that will be paid by SRO for errors. The variance now also reflects increasing the encumbrance for respondent costs for web surveys. Agreement for coverage of overrun is underway with PI-

Projections
Jun 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month: 56,092.50
Actual Dollars Used: 57,754.36
Variance (Projected minus Actual): -1,661.86
Reason For Variance: slightly higher FTF tracking costs than estimated. FTF tracking stopped in mid-June.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1046		5.5
Goal at Completion:	1030	.75	5.2
Current actual:	953	.52	4.07
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	Surveys of Consumer Attitudes (SCA 2015)				
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 699,673.00	Indirect Budget: 0.00	Total Budget: 699,673.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Dr. Richard T. Curtin (SRC)				
Funding Agency	Bloomberg, others for Riders.				
IRB	HUM#:	Period Of Approval:	thru 10/30/2015		
Project Team	Project Lead: Joseph Matthew Matuzak Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens Production Manager: Senior Project Advisor: Mary P Maher Production Manager: Andrea Sims Production Manager:				
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>The monthly Surveys of Consumers are a series of nationally representative surveys with households in the contiguous United States. The SCA is designed to measure changes in consumer attitudes and expectations.</p> <p>The objectives of the surveys are to learn what consumers think about economic events under varying circumstances and to determine why they think and behave as they do. Since changes in attitudes and expectations occur in advance of behavior, measures of consumer attitudes and expectations can act as leading indicators of aggregate economic activity. The survey measures are not intended to establish the absolute level of consumer sentiment at any given time. The SCA is intended to measure change. Each month the SSL interviewing staff obtains 500 interviews.</p>				
SRO Project Period	01/2015 - 12/2015				
Data Col Period	01/2015 - 12/2015				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:				
Other Project Team Members:	Dave Dybicki Ann Munster Pamela Swanson Jennie Williams LaVelvet Harrison				
Other Project Names:					
Sample Mgmt Sys	SMS				
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8				
Hardware	Desktop				
DE Software	Blaise 4.8 BIA				
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CXM				
Incentive	Yes, R				
Administration	SRO Group				
Payment Type	Check, post (\$5); Cash, prepaid (\$5)				
Payment Method	Check through STRak RPay System; Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office				

Report Period	June, 2015 (SCA 2015)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

Monthly Update	SCA finished its June study two days early, which marks the tenth month in a row we have managed an early finish. We completed 506 interviews, with 335 RDDs from cell cases, and 171 Recons, 44 of which were from landline sample. The instrument was 30.2 minutes in length, and our HPI was 2.79. We used 1410.2 interviewer hours in
-----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

production. Overall, this was a fairly smooth month. This month included the rider developed by SMP students, and also reflects the final month SCA contained landline sample.

Special Issues

Cost

Jun 09, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	306,430.11	
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	741,954.13	
Total Budget:	699,673.00	
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-42,281.13	
Reason For Variance:	There has been some scope creep from the budget -- Study Staff printed newsletters in color format for the first time, and also added an incentive experiment for cell Recons 35 years of age and under. February's instrument was also longer than projected. While we are projecting high, our total interviewer usage is over by about a hundred hours per month, and we anticipate being able to reduce that going forward	

Projections

Jun 09, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	66,992.86	
Actual Dollars Used:	5,354.44	
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	-8,039.80	
Reason For Variance:	Our higher than expected HPI, despite a good dialing rate, meant we needed additional interviewer hours, and this along with some costs from training new interviewers, is the majority of the deficit.	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:	500	10	2.50
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:	506	10	2.79
Variance:	6	0	0.29

Other Measures

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:	7/31/2014-7/30/2015		
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	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="text-align: center; padding: 5px;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:				
Other Project Team Members:	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) Campus Sustainability				
Other Project Names:					
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	June, 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 the 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 modifications 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 Zahr 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 Zahr 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)

May '14

Minako is working on maps from the 2014 data collection. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako). Dan finished the panel weights this month. Andrew, Bob and Noah met with the group in Brazil about fielding a related study in that country. There has been discussion of traveling to Brazil to aid them in their design and implementation of their sustainability study, slated for Spring of 2016. The PSM student (Will) who has been doing some analysis is going to Westat for the summer. Paul Burton is assisting Andrew with some operational and experimental analysis of things implemented on the 2014 SCIP.

To do:

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

June '14

Minako is working on maps from the 2014 data collection. Meetings continued between Andrew, the PIs and the analysts (Will and Minako). Paul Burton is assisting Andrew with operational and experimental analysis from the 2014 SCIP. We are waiting to hear about next fiscal year's funding. The budget request is part of the OVPR budget that was up for approval at the Regents meeting on June 18. We expect to hear relatively soon to be able to continue work from the 2014 survey into fiscal year 2016 and plan for the Fall 2015 survey. Andrew submitted the continuing renewal to the IRB.

To do:

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

Special Issues

Cost

Jun 30, 2015

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	61,337.45
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	69,314.61
Total Budget:	69,329.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	14.39
Reason For Variance:	

Projections

Jun 30, 2015

Dollars Projected For Month:	5,289.91
Actual Dollars Used:	3,997.99
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	1,291.92
Reason For Variance:	Actual analyst time was less than projected. 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 End: 08/14/2014

Staffing Completed: 09/08/2014

SS Train Start: 10/17/2014

DC Start: 10/27/2014

Pretest Start: 07/24/2014

Recruitment Start: 06/01/2014

GIT Start: 10/15/2014

SS Train End: 10/22/2014

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	June, 2015 (CDS 2014)	Project Phase	Closing
Risk Level	<i>On Track</i>		
Monthly Update	During the month of June, SRO met with the PIs to discuss a fall follow-up effort. During that meeting the PIs expressed interest in planning a follow-up on the following components: IVR, Linkage Consents, and Time Diaries. The PIs will provide SRO a workscope plan so that SRO can prepare cost estimates. SRO delivered CDS data sets to the PIs so that they can move forward with their analysis on the impact of CDS on Core PSID. This analysis will factor into their final decision on whether to proceed with the fall follow-up. In addition, the PIs are interested in SRO coding approximately 27 open-ends, in addition to the already budgeted occ/ind coding. Time diary data entry began in mid-June. Occ/Ind coding to start pending programming changes needed to study staff's application for the additional 27 fields. In mid-June, the PIs provided instructions on 60+ SIDS for final coding. Final data delivery will be at end of June.		
Special Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 May 31, 2015	<p>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 5,380,007.94</p> <p>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 5,680,043.57</p> <p>Total Budget: 6,867,361.00</p> <p>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 1,187,317.43</p> <p>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.</p>		
Projections May 31, 2015	<p>Dollars Projected For Month: 409,644.81</p> <p>Actual Dollars Used: 336,506.67</p> <p>Variance (Projected minus Actual): 73,138.14</p> <p>Reason For Variance: Hours for the month were over-projected as some post data collection activities were delayed pending programming of applications by study staff.</p>		

Measures	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:	2881	93%	4.29
Current actual:	2,854	89% unweighted	4.09
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 88% RR)

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

Birth Linkage Consents: 92% (current 38% RR)

School Linkage Consents: 92% (current 36% RR)

Saliva Collection: 85% (current 45%RR)

Child Time Diaries: 85% (current 46%)

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