

Survey Research Operations

Monthly Project Report

Sponsored Projects

June 2016



Sponsored Projects

(ABCD) Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development
(A-STARRS LS) Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study
(BAM2) Becoming A Man 2
(CogUSA Saliva) CogUSA Tablet and Saliva Collection
(DMACS) Detroit Metropolitan Area Survey
(HCAP 2016) Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol
(HRS 2016) Health and Retirement Study
(HCDC, H&C) Housing & Children
(CAMS 2015) HRS 2015 Consumption and Activity Mail Study
(HRS LHMS 2015) HRS Life History Mail Survey 2015
(Forgiveness2015) Humility, Forgiveness and Social Relations: Ethnic & Racial Comparison
(MTTS) Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study
(MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF Illume Web 2016) Monitoring the Future Web Programming and Survey Pilot
(MTF Tablet Pilot) MTF Base Year Tablet Pilot
(STEM) National Science Writing Survey
(NSFG 2010-2020) National Survey of Family Growth
(AHRB) Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior
(YRS) Optimizing Youth Suicide Risk Screening and Triage In the Emergency Department
(PSID All Stars) PSID Web Explore Core
(PSID-WB) PSID Wellbeing
(SN&WB) Social Networks and Well Being
(SCA 2016) Surveys of Consumer Attitudes
(SCIP-2015) Sustainability Cultural Indicators Program-2015

Project Name Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD)

Project Mode Primary: Mixed Secondary: Mixed Total of Modes: 2

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

Budget ***Direct Budget:*** 277,805.00 ***Indirect Budget:*** 0.00 ***Total Budget:*** 430,596.00

Principal Investigator/Client Mary Heitzeg (UM Dept of Psychiatry)

Funding Agency NIH

IRB ***HUM#:*** HUM00106316 ***Period Of Approval:*** 9/10/2015-1/7/2017

Project Team ***Project Lead:*** Karin Schneider
Budget Analyst: Janelle P Cramer
Production Manager: _UnAssigned
Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul
Production Manager: _UnAssigned
Production Manager: _UnAssigned

Proposal #: no data

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

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

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

SRO Project Period 05/2016 - 03/2018

Data Col Period 05/2016 - 02/2018

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 05/15/2016

Pretest End:

Staffing Completed: 05/20/2016

SS Train Start:

DC Start: 05/20/2016

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start: 05/20/2016

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

DC End: 02/28/2018

Other Project Team Members:

Other Project Names: Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development

Sample Mgmt Sys NA

Data Col Tool NA

Hardware NA

DE Software NA

QC Recording Tool NA

Incentive NA

Administration NA

Payment Type NA

Payment Method NA

Report Period June, 2016 (ABCD)

Project Phase Implementing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update Three schools have been recruited and agreed to disseminate the project's recruitment material. Two are (large - more than 150 3rd/4th graders) public schools, one (small) private school. Recruitment materials were delivered to all

three schools. This totals approximately 450 recruitment packets. Six parents made contact with the project staff thus far. One parochial school refused to participate (on the grounds that families will not want their children to have MRIs, part of the clinical portion of the study. We expect to have very few school contacts through July, but will resume outreach in August.

Special Issues

None

Cost**May 30, 2016**

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 4,133.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 430,596.00
Total Budget: 430,596.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 0.00
Reason For Variance:

Projections**May 30, 2016**

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

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i>	54		
<i>Goal at Completion:</i>	54		
<i>Current actual:</i>	3		
<i>Estimate at Complete:</i>	54		
<i>Variance:</i>			

Other Measures

Project Name	Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study (A-STARRS LS)												
Project Mode	Primary: Web	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 3										
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget: 8,218,215.00	Indirect Budget: 4,520,018.00	Total Budget: 12,738,233.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	James Wagner (University of Michigan) Robert Ursano (Uniformed Services University of the Health Scienc) Murray Stein (University of California San Diego)												
Funding Agency	Department of Defense												
IRB	HUM#: HUM00099203	Period Of Approval:	2/18/2016-2/17/2017										
Project Team	Project Lead: Nancy J Gebler Budget Analyst: William Lokers Production Manager: Ruth B Philippou Senior Project Advisor: Mary P Maher Production Manager: Margaret Lee Hudson Production Manager: Andrew L Hupp												
Proposal #:	no data												
Description:	<p>This project is a continuation of the Army STARRS study (Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers). For STARRS LS, we will attempt to reinterview all respondents from the All Army Study (AAS), New Soldier Study (NSS) and Pre-Post Deployment Study (PPDS) samples using a web-phone multi mode study. Each of the approximately 70,000 eligible respondents will be invited to participate once every two years. In addition to reinterviewing the AAS, NSS and PPDS samples; STARRS LS will continue to maintain and support the Research Data Enclave, allowing members of the research team and collaborators to analyze primary Army STARRS data as well as de-identified historical administrative data received from the Army and Department of Defense (DoD). Additionally, STARRS LS will continue to receive and link de-identified administrative data to the survey data (from the original Army STARRS data collection as well as STARRS LS surveys). These data will also be made available in the Research Data Enclave.</p>												
SRO Project Period	02/2015 - 11/2019												
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 11/2019												
Security Plan	NA												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 02/01/2015</td> <td>Pretest Start: 10/14/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End: 03/31/2016</td> <td>Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed:</td> <td>GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start:</td> <td>SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 08/08/2016</td> <td>DC End: 08/30/2019</td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: 02/01/2015	Pretest Start: 10/14/2015	Pretest End: 03/31/2016	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start:	SS Train End:	DC Start: 08/08/2016	DC End: 08/30/2019
PreProduction Start: 02/01/2015	Pretest Start: 10/14/2015												
Pretest End: 03/31/2016	Recruitment Start:												
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:												
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:												
DC Start: 08/08/2016	DC End: 08/30/2019												
Other Project Team Members:	Heather Schroeder, Leah Roberts, Rachel LeClere, Ryan Yoder, Laura Yoder, Andrew Piskowrowski, Lisa Lewandowski-Romps, Lamont Manley, Emily Blaczyk, Genise Pattulo,												
Other Project Names:													
Sample Mgmt Sys	MSMS												
Data Col Tool	Blaise 5												
Hardware	Desktop												
DE Software	N/A												
QC Recording Tool	Live monitoring												
Incentive	Yes, R												
Administration	SRO Group												
Payment Type	Check, post (\$50-\$100); Cash, prepaid (\$2 (or Challenge coin)); Other (Army STARRS challenge coin (provide												
Payment Method	Check through other system (MSMS); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (MSMS); Other (Army STA												

Report Period	June, 2016 (A-STARRS LS)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	<p>Activities for June 2016 include:</p> <p>Project Management and Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We worked with the PIs and ODUSA to finalize the study fact brochure and other recruitment materials. The IRB amendment containing final production protocols and recruitment materials was submitted at UM and is currently in expedited review. 		

- We began work on the IRB amendment and Individual Investigator Agreement needed for receipt of the GAT data.
- We continued to plan for production data collection. The start of data collection has been delayed to early August to give us time to get IRB approvals for the final production materials and finish development on our technical systems.
- Gebler attended briefings with senior NCOs for the Army, Guard and Reserve who will record messages encouraging study participation. She also worked at the ODUSA office to finalize scripts, study fact brochure, and other recruitment materials.
- We continue to track and report on the various requests to the Army, including AAG server setup and data receipt for the expanded HADS, and approvals needed prior to the start of production interviewing.

Enclave and User Support:

- Members of the Enclave IT team met with AAG to begin work on the annual security review. The Army has implemented several changes to its security requirements since our last review, and the team was given a 400-item checklist which must be completed as part of our review. New software (used to provide security scans for our servers) is being purchased and several other modifications will need to be made as a result of this year's review. At the end of the review we expect to receive an official Authority To Operate (ATO).
- The Flux system is moving to a new two-factor authentication access protocol. We have notified our users, and will keep them informed of requirements for the new protocol.
- Background check and Flux user access requests have been processed throughout the month.
- The enclave team continues to answer user questions and process data transfer requests as needed, and continues to receive, track and process requests for new software and license renewals as needed.

Financial, Cost Monitoring

- We reviewed our May expenses and updated cost estimates for Years 2-5 based on current information about timeline, staffing, and scope assumptions. We updated our costs to reflect the new start date, and also updated costs for the increased incentives (\$50 and \$100), and reduced interviewer hours to keep projected costs for data collection within budget.

Technical Systems Development, Programming

- The questionnaire programs (web, mobile device, and telephone versions) have been finalized and approved.
- We continued work on our sample management system and integrating this system with the latest version of Blaise. We are working through several challenges, including unexpected technical issues and staffing shortages which resulted in some schedule delays.
- We continued the development of data collection reports used to monitor and evaluate production data collection progress.
- We are working with the vendor to incorporate the recorded messages and IVR systems with our systems at Michigan.

Data Collection Progress and Plans:

- The start of data collection has been rescheduled, to give our team more time to finish our technical systems and obtain IRB approvals. Data collection is now scheduled to begin the week of August 8.
- Interviewer training has been rescheduled for the week of August 22, for an August 31 start to telephone calling.
- We revised the recruitment materials and worked with Harvard and ODUSA to finalize the study fact brochure.
- We received the first batch of challenge coins to be sent with the first batch of pre-notification letters. We do not currently have enough coins to fill the first replicate, and we are planning to implement an experiment, with part of the sample receiving the coin and part receiving \$2 in the pre-notification letter for the first replicate. The Army is working with the vendor to ship enough coins for the future replicates.
- We received the first batch of address lookups from the ODUSA and sent three more replicates to them.

Cost Report:

Our estimate of current costs, and a preliminary cost-to-complete projection by task and year is shown in Table 1 below. We spent a total of \$152,171 in May 2016 on pre-production planning, programming and testing, and enclave support activities.

We are currently projecting a surplus of \$35,112 for the total project (0.3% of the total budget), reducing projected total costs by \$211,560 from last month's report. We made some adjustments to our staffing allocations to bring our total cost projections down, and fewer hours were worked in May than we had projected. We will continue to fine-tune our cost estimates and make adjustments to ensure that we stay within budget for the total project. Table 1 below provides cost detail by year and task.

Table 1: STARRS LS Cost Report for May 2016

	Pre & Post Production*	Data Collection**	Project Management	Enclave and User Support	Grand Total
Year 1 Budget	\$570,566	\$55,702	\$247,428	\$245,622	\$1,119,318
Actual year 1 costs	\$503,866	\$18,789	\$295,639	\$223,616	\$1,041,910

	Variance	\$66,700	\$36,913	(\$48,211)	\$22,006	\$77,408		
Year 2	Budget	\$574,123	\$1,976,966	\$462,928	\$618,848	\$3,632,865		
	Actual costs through Apr 2016		\$460,488	\$21,012	\$157,197	\$181,929	\$820,625	
	Actual costs for May 2016	\$60,305	\$11,669	\$38,427	\$41,771	\$152,171		
	Projected costs June-Nov	\$314,551	\$778,325	\$244,477	\$317,786	\$1,655,138		
	Year 2 projected total cost	\$835,343	\$811,005	\$440,101	\$541,486	\$2,627,935		
	Variance (\$261,220)	\$1,165,961	\$22,827	\$77,362	\$1,004,930			
Year 3	Budget	\$400,008	\$1,981,395	\$476,249	\$603,408	\$3,461,060		
	Year 3 projected total cost	\$417,892	\$2,397,362	\$451,138	\$591,511	\$3,857,904		
	Variance (\$17,884)	(\$415,967)	\$25,111	\$11,897	(\$396,844)			
Year 4	Budget	\$280,594	\$1,055,329	\$410,278	\$654,463	\$2,400,664		
	Year 4 projected total cost	\$339,561	\$1,293,602	\$386,457	\$638,480	\$2,658,100		
	Variance (\$58,967)	(\$238,273)	\$23,821	\$15,983	(\$257,436)			
Year 5	Budget	\$263,619	\$805,264	\$418,806	\$636,637	\$2,124,326		
	Year 5 projected total cost	\$310,676	\$1,199,132	\$391,081	\$616,383	\$2,517,272		
	Variance (\$47,057)	(\$393,868)	\$27,725	\$20,254	(\$392,946)			
	Total Budget	\$2,088,910	\$5,874,656	\$2,015,689	\$2,758,978	\$12,738,233		
	Total Projected Cost at Completion		\$2,407,338	\$5,719,890	\$1,964,417	\$2,611,476	\$12,703,121	
	Total Variance	(\$318,428)	\$154,766	\$51,272	\$147,502	\$35,112		

*Includes costs for the pilot, totaling \$134,000.

**Data Collection will be separated into Wave 1 and Wave 2 (the first and second interviews with our sample participants) in future reports. Data Collection includes the cost of training pilot interviewers, who will also work on Wave 1.

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

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

- Respondent participation.
 - o We will release the sample in replicates (random sub-samples), starting slowly and ramping up the sizes of the releases in the early months. We are including a series of experiments for the early months of production. We plan to evaluate the results of the experiments to identify and implement the survey design that maximizes the amount of survey data we can collect within the available budget.
 - o We will work with Harvard and the Army to increase our outreach efforts, coordinating public relations releases from the Army with our data collection launch.
- Locating respondents.
 - o The ODUSA staff is working to get home address and telephone numbers from the DEERS system. They will also work on obtaining address updates from commercial locating vendors. We will evaluate the updated contact information as it becomes available. Approval to receive batch updates from DEERS has been requested, but is not yet approved. In the meantime, we will submit sample lists to the ODUSA for manual look-ups prior to the start of data collection.
- New technical systems.
 - o We are implementing new interviewing software (Blaise 5) as well as a new sample management system. We are identifying a number of improvements that we will be implemented for production. This is increasing our pre-production costs, but should improve our efficiency and provide better data to evaluate results for production.
 - o We pushed back the start of data collection to give our team more time to complete development and testing of all systems.
 - o The contact protocol outlined by Harvard contains several innovative techniques, and is quite complicated. A complex protocol poses two risks. First, it increases the amount of staff time needed to specify, program and test the automated sample management system. Second, the more complex the programming, the higher the risk of cases getting mis-routed or "lost" in the system, which can increase the time spent by supervisors, project managers, programmers, and data managers on sample review and corrections. We are working to mitigate these risks by increasing our testing time for these systems.
- Questionnaire length.
 - o We are implementing a few strategies, including the use of a short questionnaire with some nonresponders, and increasing incentives to motivate more people to take the time needed to complete the interview.
- Requests for Army approvals.
 - o We have been informed that our protocols have been reviewed, and no objections were raised. We still do not have formal approval memos back from the Army, but do not anticipate any delays given the unofficial approvals have already been granted.
- IRB approvals.
 - o We submitted the IRB protocol modification for the updated scripts and recruitment materials, and are waiting to hear back from the Michigan IRB. We check in with them every week, and have not been informed of any issues. However, we still do not have approval. The application is in expedited review and we hope to get approval soon and then submit the protocols to USUHS for their IRB review.
 - o The USUHS IRB is working with a new system, and they also have been experiencing longer than usual review times.
 - o We will continue to work closely with the IRB committees to try to expedite the review process as much as possible.
- Background checks.
 - o We continue to experience long wait times for background checks, and have been notified that electronic fingerprints will be needed in the near future. This impacts new analysts hired for work on STARRS, who must have a background check before they are given Enclave access.
 - o It has affected our IT staff, resulting in some service delays. We have experienced some IT staff attrition and are working on getting their replacements through the background check process (required before they can work on STARRS laptops).
 - o We are also experiencing attrition on our drop box staff, and are working to identify replacements (who also must have background checks).
 - o We are working closely with the USUHS security officer who submits the background check requests, and keep project managers informed as we get progress updates.

Cost

Jun 24, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	2,014,707.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	12,703,121.00
Total Budget:	12,738,233.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	35,111.00
Reason For Variance:	

We continue to adjust our projections on a monthly basis, and will bring our variance down to zero by the time the project ends. It is still early in the project, and we are still negotiating the timing and scope for our production data collection activities.

Projections

Jun 24, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	195,805.00
Actual Dollars Used:	152,171.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	43,634.00

Reason For Variance:

Fewer hours were charged than projected. This is due to staff time off and getting pulled to other projects, and also due to moving some scope back in time.

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	Becoming A Man 2 (BAM2)												
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face	Total of Modes: 1											
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget: 1,263,231.00	Indirect Budget: 675,224.00	Total Budget: 1,938,455.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Jens Ludwig (University of Chicago)												
Funding Agency	NIH												
IRB	HUM#:	Period Of Approval:											
Project Team	Project Lead:	Sarah Crane											
	Budget Analyst:	Christine Evanchek											
	Production Manager:	Barbara Aghababian-Homburg											
	Senior Project Advisor:	Nicole G Kirgis											
	Production Manager:	Hongyu Johnson											
	Production Manager:												
Proposal #:	no data												
Description:	The purpose of this study is to complete in-person interviews with approximately 1200 male students aged 12-18 from 21 pre-selected Chicago Public Schools.												
SRO Project Period	06/2015 - 05/2016												
Data Col Period	11/2015 - 04/2016												
Security Plan	Yes												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start:</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed:</td> <td>GIT Start: 11/01/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start: 11/03/2015</td> <td>SS Train End: 11/06/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 11/08/2015</td> <td>DC End: 04/29/2016</td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start: 11/01/2015	SS Train Start: 11/03/2015	SS Train End: 11/06/2015	DC Start: 11/08/2015	DC End: 04/29/2016
PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:												
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:												
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start: 11/01/2015												
SS Train Start: 11/03/2015	SS Train End: 11/06/2015												
DC Start: 11/08/2015	DC End: 04/29/2016												
Other Project	Jeff Smith SurveyTrak												
Team Members:	Holly Ackerman WebTrak/WebLog/reports Jim Hagerman CAI Minako Edgar Data Manager Shaowei Sun SRIS Andrea Pierce/Larry Daher Help Desk												
Other Project Names:	Remediating Academic and Non-Academic Skills Deficit Among Disadvantaged Youth												
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak; Other (SRIS)												
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; Other (PAPI math assessment)												
Hardware	Laptop; Paper and Pencil; Other (barcode scanners)												
DE Software	Blaise 4.8 BIA ; Other (post collection transcription from audio files)												
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Camtasia												
Incentive	Yes, R												
Administration	SRO Group												
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid (\$50.00); Other (Cash, prenotification letter)												
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office												
Report Period	June, 2016 (BAM2)	Project Phase	Implementing										
Risk Level	Some Concerns												
Monthly Update	<p>The client has again agreed to extending data collection, this time through July if necessary. Dwindling sample has necessitated consolidation of staff down to 6 remaining interviewers.</p> <p>Production is very slow (<5 lws/week) and it's likely that we will not meet our response rate goal of 89% (we are currently at 85%). The project lead is meeting internally with the project SPA, as well as with the client in early July to discuss implications of this shortfall.</p> <p>The transcription piece has caught up on the backlog of cases, and remains under budget.</p>												

Special Issues

Persistent under-run.

Cost

Jun 21, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 1,612,431.74**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 1,851,904.40**Total Budget:** 1,938,455.00**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 86,550.60**Reason For Variance:**

Overall, BAM2 continues to project a substantial under-run. Production HPI has continued to stay steady, and data entry hours remain far below what was budgeted in the proposal.

Projections

Jun 21, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 154,331.23**Actual Dollars Used:** 113,263.03**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 41,068.20**Reason For Variance:**

May expenditures were off from projections due to drastically decreased production, and needing to move forward the bulk of transcription hours to June.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	Phase 2: 157	89 Calculated	16 (phase 2)
Goal at Completion:	1263 (1106 + 157)	89	12 (average)
Current actual:	Phase 2: 123	85	11
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	CogUSA Tablet and Saliva Collection (CogUSA Saliva)												
Project Mode	Primary: Mail	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 2										
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget: 171,995.00	Indirect Budget: 266,593.00	Total Budget: 266,593.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Jack McArdle (USC) Brooke Helppie (UM/SRC)												
Funding Agency	National Institute of Aging (NIA)												
IRB	HUM#: HUM00001406	Period Of Approval:											
Project Team	Project Lead: Zoanne Blackburn Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens Production Manager: Joseph Matthew Matuzak Senior Project Advisor: Kirsten Haakan Alcser Production Manager: Production Manager:												
Proposal #:	no data												
Description:	<p>The purpose of this study is to follow up with approximately 700 respondents from the last data collection wave of CogUSA. SRO will mail an advance letter, a pre-assembled tablet and saliva packets, and a reminder card to all respondents. Additionally, SRO will make an average of 4 follow-up calls to all respondents to schedule a delivery time and UPS pickup time and 3 telephone attempts to non-responders to remind them to return the tablets and saliva kits. SRO will log in returned saliva kits for storage at a local laboratory and return tablets to the PI at the conclusion of the study. We have budgeted for approximately 455 respondents to return their saliva samples and provide responses on the tablets.</p> <p>This budget assumes an overall SRO involvement period of 5 months commencing in November 2015 with the data collection taking place during a 2-month period, beginning January 2016.</p>												
SRO Project Period	11/2015 - 04/2016												
Data Col Period	01/2016 - 04/2016												
Security Plan	NA												
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 11/01/2015</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed:</td> <td>GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start:</td> <td>SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 01/25/2016</td> <td>DC End: 06/30/2016</td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: 11/01/2015	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start:	SS Train End:	DC Start: 01/25/2016	DC End: 06/30/2016
PreProduction Start: 11/01/2015	Pretest Start:												
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:												
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:												
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:												
DC Start: 01/25/2016	DC End: 06/30/2016												
Other Project Team Members:	Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun, Dave Dybicki, Minako Edgar, Emily Blasyck, David Bolt												
Other Project Names:													
Sample Mgmt Sys	Project specific system (CMS)												
Data Col Tool	Other (USC program on tablet computer)												
Hardware	Tablet												
DE Software	Other (CMS)												
QC Recording Tool	N/A												
Incentive	Yes, R												
Administration	SRO Group												
Payment Type	Check, post (\$40); Cash, prepaid (\$2)												
Payment Method	Check through STRak RPay System; Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office												

Report Period	June, 2016 (CogUSA Saliva)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

Monthly Update	<p>We have reduced the number of overdue tablets to only about five, and have managed to get a few of the most overdue cases returned by concentrating our calling. We are almost at our goal of 400 completed tablet interviews, and will likely exceed that, as we will extend collection through July since there is still money left in the budget. We currently have a fair number of tablets on hand, and are working through the remaining unresolved sample lines to try to identify the last of the respondents who will agree to participate.</p>
-----------------------	---

The decision has been made to extend our collection period into July, with a likely cut-off date for sending tablets of somewhere around the middle of the month. Then we will concentrate on getting the remaining tablets returned and cleaning up the sample.

We still appear to be ok in terms of our interviewer hours budget even with extending and adding additional calls, and our clerk time is also within bounds. We will of course continue to monitor this.

Special Issues

Cost

Jun 07, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 193,196.21

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 220,375.85

Total Budget: 266,593.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 46,217.15

Reason For Variance:

The project continues moving at a slower pace than projected, and management and clerk costs will end up higher. Projections are again being carried over to later in the study. This variance will lessen as we extend our operational time.

Projections

Jun 07, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 27,179.64

Actual Dollars Used: 24,237.05

Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00

Reason For Variance:

Additional calling hours needed to remind respondents to return tablets, continuing to recruit new respondents.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	400		
Goal at Completion:	400		
Current actual:	393		
Estimate at Complete:	410		
Variance:	10		

Other Measures

Project Name Detroit Metropolitan Area Survey (DMACS)

Project Mode Primary: Mixed

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

Budget **Direct Budget:** 233,426.00 **Indirect Budget:** 23,343.00 **Total Budget:** 256,769.00

Principal Investigator/Client Jeff Morenoff (Population Studies)
Elizabeth Gerber

Funding Agency Kresge Foundation

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

Project Team **Project Lead:** Barbara Lohr Ward
Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens
Production Manager: Bridgitte Wyche McGee
Senior Project Advisor: Kirsten Haakan Alcser
Production Manager: Joseph Matthew Matuzak
Production Manager: Bridgitte Wyche McGee

Proposal #: no data

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

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

SRO Project Period 04/2016 - 02/2017
Data Col Period 07/2016 - 01/2017
Security Plan NA
Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 04/01/2016
Pretest End:
Staffing Completed:
SS Train Start:
DC Start: 09/01/2016

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

Other Project Team Members: Barb Ward - Survey Director; Joe Matuzak - Project Manager; Dan Zahs - Sampling; Sue Hodge - SSA; Kirsten Alcser - SPA; Paul Schultz - programmer; Lisa Quist - data manager; J. Smith - Surveytrak programmer.

Other Project**Names:****Sample Mgmt Sys**

SurveyTrak; Illume

Data Col Tool

Illume; SAQ

Hardware

Laptop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil

DE Software

Illume

QC Recording Tool

N/A

Incentive

Yes, R

Administration

SRO Group

Payment Type

Check, post (\$20 or \$10); Cash, prepaid (\$2)

Payment Method

Check through STRak RPay System; Check through other system (Export from Illume); Imprest Cash Fund from

Report Period

June, 2016 (DMACS)

Project Phase

Initiation

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

During June, 2016, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Met with research team to discuss new proposal for Ford
- Adjusted data collection plan, monthly projections and cost estimates.
- Budget error and projected overrun memo approved by SRC
- Provided input for IRB revisions. IRB application approved.

Task 2: Sampling

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Wave 1 questionnaire finalized
- Wave 2 questionnaire deadline pushed back to August 1st
- Discussed and approved changes recommended by programmer to reflect multiple modes

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Met with programmer, gained programmer access to newest version of Illume
- Programmer reviewed instrument and began programming

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Email address set up for project
- Basic SurveyTrak build completed

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

- Began defining recruitment timeline

Task 8: Main Data Collection

Task 9: Post Collection Processing

Task 10: Weighting

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

Cost information: Kresge Foundation funding

Total survey funding awarded:	\$	256,770
Total Expended as of 6/10/2016	\$	11,415
Expected cost at complete	\$	273,835
Expected Variance:	\$	(17,066)

Cost explanation:

The cost estimate reflects survey funding awarded to Michigan (SRO) for data collection activities, current expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award.

The cost estimate projects an overrun, due to inadvertent underbudgeting of interviewer hour and other expenses. This overrun has been reviewed by SRC, and will need to be carefully monitored as the project progresses.

Special Issues**Areas of Concern:**

- Budget/Expenses – The data collection budget is challenging. Most line items are budgeted at the minimum possible amount. Changes in schedule or design will negatively impact the projected expenses.
- This is considered to be a feasibility study. The design of the study is intended to determine if the proposed sampling and contact plan is a feasible way of developing a web survey panel. Response rates may be optimistic for the sampling/contact plan and schedule.
- The project is running about one month behind schedule due to late delivery of the questionnaire. We estimate launching the data collection effort in early September, and Wave 2 has been simplified. We are working to keep the PIs on schedule.
- Interviewer recruitment presumes only using on-staff interviewers, including bilingual skills. Additional cost is a risk if we need instead to have one or more new hires.

Cost
Jun 10, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 11,414.87
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 273,834.97
Total Budget: 256,769.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -17,065.97
Reason For Variance: The cost estimate projects an overrun, due to inadvertent underbudgeting of interviewer hour and other expenses. This overrun has been reviewed by SRC, and will need to be carefully monitored as the project progresses.

Projections
Jun 10, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 0.00
Actual Dollars Used: 0.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00
Reason For Variance: The PIs did not deliver the questionnaire until late in the month, so programming, translation, and preparation costs were pushed forward.

Measures

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Harmonized Cognitive Assessment Protocol (HCAP 2016)					
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 2			
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current			
Budget	Direct Budget: 3,291,705.00	Indirect Budget: 1,185,014.00	Total Budget: 4,476,719.00			
Principal Investigator/Client	David Weir (SRC-ISR) Ken Langa (SRC-ISR) Lindsay Ryan (SRC-ISR)					
Funding Agency						
IRB	HUM#: HUM00099822	Period Of Approval:	3/17/2015 - 3/16/201			
Project Team	Project Lead: Evanthia Leissou Budget Analyst: Richard Warren Krause Production Manager: Dianne G Casey Senior Project Advisor: Mary P Maher Production Manager: Donnalee Ann Grey-Farquharson Production Manager: Anthony Romanowski					
Proposal #:	no data					
Description:	<p>This project will involve the completion of a face-to-face CAPI interview, designed to provide a dementia assessment of HRS respondents. A sample of 5000 respondents (one per household) who are 65 years of age or older will be selected for this effort. The questionnaire will be administered to respondents after the HRS 2016 interview has been completed. The sample will not be clustered geographically; it will be selected randomly. It is expected that the field team will carry out well-planned regional trips in order to complete the 3000 in-person interviews. An informant interview will also be completed for each of the respondents interviewed.</p> <p>The respondent questionnaire length is expected to be 60 minutes. The informant questionnaire is expected to be 20 minutes and can be administered by telephone when the interviewer calls to set up an appointment with the respondent for the face-to-face interview.</p>					
SRO Project Period	01/2015 - 12/2017					
Data Col Period	05/2016 - 02/2017					
Security Plan	NA					
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: </td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start:	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End:					
Other Project Team Members:	Applications Programmers: Jeff Smith (STrak), Holly Ackerman (Webtrak, Weblog) CAI Programmer: Jim Hagerman Data Manager: Brad Goodwin Help Desk: Deb Wilson					
Other Project Names:						
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak					
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8					
Hardware	Laptop; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil					
DE Software	Excel					
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Camtasia					
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, INF					
Administration	NA					
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (\$50); Check, post (\$25)					
Payment Method	Check through STrak RPay System					

Report Period	June, 2016 (HCAP 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	Some Concerns		
Monthly Update	While We received final IRB approval on June 7th. Prenotification letters and checks were mailed to 567 Respondents on June 10. We started calling respondents on June 14 and as of June 30 we have 113 Respondent and 82 Informant interviews.		

While waiting for the IRB approval, interviewers attended regular weekly meetings with their TLs where they discussed interviewing protocols and before sample was released, we issued a refresher training course. It was a power point presentation accessed via Moodle, which they reviewed before starting to call Respondents.

While waiting for IRB approval and start of production, we worked on Strak edits and Spanish questionnaires (programming and testing in CTT).

The second sample release is planned for July 8th and it's estimated at 600-700 cases.

The second interviewer training is planned for the fall, approximately mid-October. We will be training close to 30 interviewers.

Special Issues

Cost

Jun 24, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	894,989.95
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	4,534,456.86
Total Budget:	4,476,719.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-57,734.86
Reason For Variance:	There are some work scope changes that have contributed to the increased costs for preproduction and have been documented. Examples of those are: pretest travel (not budgeted), longer interviewer training (3 vs 2 days), additional questionnaire sections which required material (smell test), R-Pay for Whole Blood Draw cases -- included in the HRS budget but will be processed in HCAP.

Current projections include the total hours for production interviewing included in the budget. These projections have not been updated since production just started.

Projections

Jun 24, 2016

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

Measures

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

Other Measures

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

Report Period	June, 2016 (HRS 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	<p>During the month of June, data collection for the new cohort component and panel component continued. Goals were revised based on actuals through week 15 of data collection anchoring screening to end December 2016 and interviewing to end April 2017. This model indicates extra hours are needed to meet target completed interviews. Additional interventions have been discussed and have been implemented during the month of June (i.e., cross-training in unstaffed areas, multiple screening interventions, etc.). Additional recruitment and training will be</p>		

necessary to add more interviewer hours in order to meet production targets by early 2017. Training is tentatively scheduled for end of August with new interviewers beginning production in September.

Technical Development: During the month of June, the Tech team focused on updating SurveyTrak for screener and main projects. Further development in production systems continues (including WebTrak and WebLog). Final adjustments are being made to the production reports and some 'tweaks' to the instrument and SurveyTrak have been released to interviewers. In addition, updates were made to technical systems in order to accommodate field interventions.

Special Issues

Cost
Jun 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	12,943,074.30
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	32,466,103.44
Total Budget:	33,579,127.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	1,113,023.56
Reason For Variance:	Projection refinements are ongoing for both Panel and New Cohort. Interviewer hour adjustments to revised goals will be implemented. Cost estimates for additional interviewer recruitment and training will be incorporated.

Projections
Jun 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	4,705,341.42
Actual Dollars Used:	3,331,877.03
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	1,373,464.39
Reason For Variance:	Actual dollars for the month of May came in under projections due to both salary and nonsalary. In terms of salary, interviewer hours came in much lower than projected due to higher than anticipated attrition. Hours are being re-projected based on current production goals. In terms of nonsalary, hosting expenses for the panel training didn't hit as expected. These projections are being pushed forward.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	24,162	88.5%	7.45
Goal at Completion:	24,162	88.5	7.45
Current actual:	6,226	25%	6.0
Estimate at Complete:	24,162	88.5	7.45
Variance:			

Other Measures

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

Project Name Housing & Children (HCDC, H&C)

Project Mode Primary: Face to Face Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

Principal Investigator/Client

Funding Agency

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

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

Proposal #: no data

Description:

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

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

SRO Project Period 04/2016 - 02/2020

Data Col Period 05/2017 - 05/2018

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

<i>PreProduction Start:</i> 04/01/2016	<i>Pretest Start:</i> 10/24/2016
<i>Pretest End:</i> 12/21/2016	<i>Recruitment Start:</i> 06/01/2016
<i>Staffing Completed:</i>	<i>GIT Start:</i> 05/09/2017
<i>SS Train Start:</i> 05/11/2017	<i>SS Train End:</i> 05/22/2017
<i>DC Start:</i> 05/26/2017	<i>DC End:</i> 05/24/2018

Other Project

Team Members:

Other Project**Names:****Sample Mgmt Sys**

SurveyTrak; SMS

Data Col Tool

Blaise 4.8; SAQ

Hardware

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

DE Software

Blaise 4.8 BIA ; External vendor (TBD)

QC Recording Tool

DRI-CARI

Incentive

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

Administration

SRO Group

Payment Type

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

Payment Method

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

Report Period

June, 2016 (HCDC, H&C)

Project Phase

Initiation

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

During June, 2016, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Held regular meetings with the research team to discuss design, deliverables, schedule, funding.
- Held meetings to discuss project staffing. Finalized composition of SRC project team. Input initial staffing projections.
- Revised and distributed project schedule.
- UM IRB Submission
 - o Maher, Benson attended UM IRB Full Board meeting
 - o Prepared and submitted administrative comments and contingencies, including updating consent, recruitment and other documents.
- Continued work on preparation of Certificate of Confidentiality.
- Held kickoff meeting for SRC staff members.
- Submitted April/May monthly report, and prepared templates for submission of initial invoice.

Task 2: Sampling

- Continued work to refine selection models and algorithm for sample selection of the population sample.
- Issued procurement for household listings in sample areas, selected vendor.

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Adult HH and Child-Specific SAQs
 - o Delivered revised recommendations on question wording and order. Formatted SAQs, prepared programming specifications for data entry.
- Child
 - o Updated assent specification and programming instructions to conform to IRB Contingency.
 - o Incorporated updates to Thin Slice question specifications; updated physical measurement instructions to current best practice.
 - o Began testing Woodcock-Johnson modules.
 - o Tested Hearts & Flowers, and notified research team of discrepancy between specification and Java program. Revised programming instructions to conform to 6/27/16 timing specification received from research team; delivered revision to programmer.
- Post Interview Observations
 - o Revised programming specifications for Child and Adult post interview observations per research team instructions; delivered to programmer.
 - o Revise data entry specifications for Neighborhood Observation and Laser Tape Measurement per research team instructions; delivered to programmer.
- Time Diary
 - o Revised data entry specification for Time Diary per research team instructions; updated format. Began investigating potential vendors for printing.
- Adult CAPI Questionnaire
 - o Delivered clean copy of adult CAPI questionnaire, including household confirmation section, for research team review and approval.
 - o Revised household confirmation section based on approved revisions. Updated programming specifications; moved selection of child respondents from Screener to Adult.
 - o Prepared best practice instruction update to physical measures section.
- Screening Questionnaire
 - o Delivered Population sample screening questionnaire and household confirmation to research team.
 - o Began updating programming specifications revisions based on approved revisions.
- Met with SRC staff to initiate Visa for Heather Prime (Toronto University) for Thin Slice Observation training.

Scheduled training, secured training location, received new models and background publications.

- Continued procurement for Pilot supply items. Researched potential vendors for specialized printing services.

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Programmed updates to Adult, Child post interview observations and prepared for testing.
- Programmed updates to neighborhood observations, laser tape measurement data entry modules and prepared for testing.

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Assembled technical team, reviewed scope and instruments. Scheduled weekly meetings.
- Updated 2014 SurveyTrak programming to interim version, in preparation for updating to current SurveyTrak release.
- Continued revisions of SurveyTrak specifications, incorporating changes for new scope, new sampling plan, and including changing the location of child respondent selection and sample line creation. Reviewed Weblog/Webtrak requirements.

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

- Finalized training dates and selected hotel vendor for Pilot training.
- Began review of available interviewing staff for Pilot. Reviewed and updated interviewer requirements and posting materials from 2014.

Task 8: Main Data Collection

- N/A

Task 9: Post Collection Processing

- N/A

Task 10: Weighting

- N/A

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

- N/A

Cost information:

Total survey funding awarded:	\$	9,134,412
Total Expended as of 5/31/2016	\$	377,916
Project Total Expended as of 5/31/2016	\$	28,794
Expected cost at complete	\$	9,134,412
Expected Variance:	\$	0

Cost explanation:

The cost estimate reflects all expected survey funding (all funders) for Michigan (SRO) for data collection activities, current expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award.

Special Issues

Areas of Concern:

- Submitted and approved proposal was based on the delivery of finalized instruments; Our current work scope for this month is almost entirely out of scope. While the impact to the budget is likely to be relatively marginal given the overall size and scope of the project, there is a clear and direct impact on the project timeline, which has already had to be shifted.
- The revised project schedule is likely to be challenging, even with adjustments made to accommodate additional, out of scope effort. We have very little room for error or missed deadlines in this schedule.

Work Scope Changes:

- Questionnaire Development – Budgets assumed that questionnaires would be ready to program. Questionnaires required extensive editing. SRC to review all questionnaires for question wording issues (especially problems created by moving questions to SAQ), create and insert transitions, review and suggest changes to module and/or question ordering.
- Questionnaire Development – Additional (and unanticipated) programming is needed for Hearts and Flowers due to specifications change received from research team.
- Schedule modifications due to funding arriving late, and the addition of questionnaire development tasks.
- Work with ICPSR to prepare scope and budget for production of public use datasets.

Cost
Jul 31, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	377,916.00
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	9,134,412.00
<i>Total Budget:</i>	9,134,412.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections
Jul 31, 2016

<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	Monthly projections not entered

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

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 border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 06/01/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 09/16/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End: 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 Logging Coordinator: Stan Hasper CAMS													
Other Project Names:														
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 RPay System													

Report Period	June, 2016 (CAMS 2015)	Project Phase	Closing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	During the month of June, a few completed questionnaires were returned by respondents. These were logged and sent to HRS staff for data entry.		
Special Issues			

Cost
May 31, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 410,472.25
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 360,925.65
Total Budget: 415,752.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -54,831.35
Reason For Variance: Sample size for CAMS 2015 is significantly smaller than originally projected which accounts for the projected under-run. Cost at complete less than total cost to date due to projecting of voided checks by business office after a certain amount of time if not cashed (note: original budget does not take into account business office voids of uncashed checks).

Projections
May 31, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 1,188.58
Actual Dollars Used: 1,101.43
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 87.15
Reason For Variance: A couple hours less were charged to the project than projected.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:	5,627	70%	
Current actual:	5,425	69%	
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures

Project Name	HRS Life History Mail Survey 2015 (HRS LHMS 2015)				
Project Mode	Primary: Mail				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current	
Budget	Direct Budget:	692,402.00	Indirect Budget:	249,263.00	Total Budget: 941,665.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Jacqui Smith Mary Beth Ofstedal				
Funding Agency	NIA with SSA				
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00106904	Period Of Approval:	10/01/15 - 04/30/16	
Project Team	Project Lead:	Piotr Dworak			
	Budget Analyst:	Richard Warren Krause			
	Production Manager:				
	Senior Project Advisor:	Laura Yoder			
	Production Manager:				
Production Manager:					
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>The HRS Life History Mail Survey (LHMS) is conducted for the first time in 2015. This research will provide important input into efforts to optimize the design of self-administered paper questionnaires to collect different types of life events. Obtained data will foster harmonization of available and newly collected data on HRS participants' life course.</p> <p>LHMS sample includes English-speaking respondents who are not participating in the concurrent HRS 2015 CAMS mail study. Approximately 12,000 HRS participants will be invited to respond to the HRS 2015 LHMS paper questionnaire. There will be no face-to-face or telephone interviewing done during this study. All contact with the respondent will be via the mail although some respondents may call the dedicated HRS toll-free line. All of the mailings will be completed during the period of October 2015, through January 2016. The project will be finalized during the months of February and March 2016.</p> <p>The LHMS questionnaire includes the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A life history calendar where respondents are asked to note important events from their lives and age at when they occurred. This is intended to serve as a guide for them when completing the remainder of the questionnaire;• A residential history section where respondents are asked to list all places of residence and any special circumstances (e.g., residing in institutional setting, military housing, etc.);• An educational history section where respondents are asked about their schools and educational experiences such as the degrees they obtained, special skills attained, learning disabilities, participation in school and other activities and in organized sports or physical activities. <p>The LHMS questionnaire is expected to take 40 – 50 minutes to complete. The questionnaires will be available in English only.</p> <p>Respondent protocol:</p> <p>Respondents will be contacted a maximum of four times via mail. In the first mailing all subjects will receive relevant study materials including an invitation letter with the informed consent information sheet, a \$25 incentive check, a questionnaire, a pre-addressed prepaid return envelope, and an address update card. Mailings will be separated by a minimum of three weeks.</p> <p>Non-respondents may receive reminders and/or up to two repeat follow up questionnaire mailings. Some participants may also receive a pencil in the mailing to facilitate filling out the questionnaire. The last mailing may be sent via USPS priority mailer. All participants who return a completed survey will receive a thank you note.</p> <p>The Survey Research Operations (SRO) unit of the Survey Research Center that conducts field activities for this project will also receive and handle any respondent calls regarding the survey; we expect approximately 100 respondent calls per week during production. A unique toll free line has been set up to accommodate these calls which will be answered by specifically trained contingent staff from the Survey Services Lab.</p>				
SRO Project Period	09/2015 - 04/2016				
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 01/2016				
Security Plan	NA				

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 09/01/2015**Pretest End:****Staffing Completed:****SS Train Start:****DC Start:****Pretest Start:****Recruitment Start:** 10/26/2015**GIT Start:****SS Train End:****DC End:**

Other Project

Piotr Dworak, Jeannie Baker

Team Members:

Other Project

Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys

SurveyTrak

Data Col Tool

SAQ

Hardware

Paper and Pencil

DE Software

External vendor (Caso (formerly Apperson))

QC Recording Tool

NA

Incentive

Yes, R

Administration

SRO Group

Payment Type

Check, prepaid (25)

Payment Method

NA

Report Period

June, 2016 (HRS LHMS 2015)

Project Phase

Implementing

Risk Level

On Track

Monthly Update

Surveys continue to trickle in - we've received total of 6485 completed surveys (up 300 from April). Thank you cards have been sent to all respondents who completed the questionnaire.

Continuing to work on data collection / scanning and delivery to the HRS client. Approximately 4000 surveys have been scanned.

Special Issues

Cost

Jun 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):

701,448.41

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):

717,612.11

Total Budget:

941,665.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):

224,052.89

Reason For Variance:

Budget for HRS off-year mail surveys is set in the proposal but actual scope / cost is refined depending on the type of the project.

Projections

Jun 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:

0.00

Actual Dollars Used:

0.00

Variance (Projected minus Actual):

0.00

Reason For Variance:

We projected and used "\$0.0" in June but also re-aligned the out of pocket costs expecting to receive further invoices from the vendor for data collection.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	6500	60%	
Goal at Completion:	7583	70%	
Current actual:	6485	59%	
Estimate at Complete:	6500	59%	
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: 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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>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: 05/01/2015
Pretest End: 08/21/2015
Staffing Completed: 07/07/2015
SS Train Start: 08/31/2015
DC Start: 09/28/2015

Pretest Start: 07/27/2015
Recruitment Start: 06/01/2015
GIT Start: 07/19/2015
SS Train End: 08/31/2015
DC End: 05/18/2016

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
 Detroit Community Study

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, 2016 (Forgiveness2015)	Project Phase	Closing
Risk Level	Not Rated		
Monthly Update	Though this month has included 9 call-in interviews, the primary activities have been related to closing out the project and include: reviewing all lines whose interviews included any data to identify and deliver any partially completed interviews, along with the completes. Occupation coding has been finalized and a preliminary dataset has been delivered. MORE...		
Special Issues	The complexities of finalizing all 19,668 lines of this ABS sample which belong to 12,725 households of this draw. This will be the final challenge for July.		
Cost			
Jun 30, 2016	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	560,118.75	
	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	563,000.00	
	Total Budget:	512,676.00	
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	-50,324.00	
	Reason For Variance:	Per prior month explanation of arrangement with Director's office, this is an anticipated overrun.	
Projections			
Jun 30, 2016	Dollars Projected For Month:	45,582.47	
	Actual Dollars Used:	35,773.18	
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	9,809.29	
	Reason For Variance:	Again, this overrun has been anticipated due to circumstances enumerated in April report.	

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1000		5.0
Goal at Completion:	1000	.10	6.0
Current actual:	1011	.10	5
Estimate at Complete:	1011		6.2
Variance:	+4		.2

Other Measures

302 MENA, 67% FE ;294 AFAmerican, 74%FE;273CaucAm, 58%FE
Spouse Respondents=137

Project Name Mathematics Teachers & Teaching Study (MTTS)

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

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

Budget ***Direct Budget:*** 792,030.00 ***Indirect Budget:*** 438,195.00 ***Total Budget:*** 1,230,225.00

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

Funding Agency

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

Project Team

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

Proposal #: no data

Description:

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

SRO Project Period

09/2014 - 06/2016

Data Col Period

01/2015 - 12/2015

Security Plan

NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start: 10/01/2014

Pretest End:

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start:

DC Start: 03/02/2015

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start: 01/26/2015

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

DC End: 05/31/2016

Other Project**Team Members:**

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

Other Project**Names:****Sample Mgmt Sys**

SMS; Project specific system (SRIS)

Data Col Tool

SAQ; Other (video recorded on tablet)

Hardware

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

DE Software

Blaise 4.8 BIA

QC Recording Tool

N/A

Incentive

NA

Administration

NA

Payment Type

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

Payment Method

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

Report Period

June, 2016 (MTTS)

Project Phase

Implementing

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

During June, 2016, SRO activities included the following:

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Participated in project management meetings with the research team
- Revised monthly projections and staffing plan. Reconciled respondent payments. Prepared monthly report.
- Began work on budget to deobligate funds.

Task 2: Sampling

- Checked sample selections for Fall 2016 data collection.
- Advised research team on design questions relating to new sample.

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

Task 4: CAI Programming

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Data Management
- o Ran ad-hoc reports as requested

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

Task 8: Main Data Collection

- Video Logging and QC
- o Received, logged final equipment return from 6 teachers, recorded 2 refusals, 4 completes
- o Logged videos
- o Processed final respondent payments.
- Packaged and shipped all remaining camera boxes, with spare parts, to Harvard.

Task 9: Post Collection Processing

- Completed final data entry for post-lesson logs, demographic survey.

Task 10: Weighting

Task 11: Final Data Deliverables

Task 12: Video Storage Systems (EWB)

- No activity.

Cost information: Harvard subcontract funded by the National Science Foundation

Total survey funding awarded:	\$	1,076,417
Total Expended as of 5/30/2016	\$	877,462
Expected cost at complete	\$	1,014,760
Expected Variance:	\$	61,567

Cost explanation:

The cost estimate reflects survey funding awarded to Michigan (SRO) for data collection activities, current expenditures, and estimated expenses to the end of the award based on an initial estimate of the impact of elimination of the MKT work scope, and with MQI recruitment ending on March 15, 2016. This budget cost projection now incorporates a deobligation of \$199,557 total cost. The projected variance anticipates a possible underrun due to

work scope decreases and a lower than anticipated response rate for the MQI video data collection.

The estimate includes additional work scope to draw a sample for the MKT, periodically monitor the MKT sample using reports prepared by Harvard, and production of weights and non-response adjustments and assist with production of a methodology report. In addition, the estimate includes additional sampling effort to draw a sample of unselected teachers for a non-response study that will be conducted by Harvard in the Fall of 2016, and develop weights and estimates for that new sample.

Special Issues

Special Notes:

Budget

- A \$199,557 total cost de-obligation of funds was processed and is now incorporated into the budget figures above. We have been told that if needed, re-obligating funds will not require permission from NSF.
- It is acknowledged that response rates are lower than anticipated. The current cost projection assumes completion of roughly 200 video sets (from 200 teachers.) The reduction in the assumption of completed video sets has reduced projected expenditures considerably.
- As noted above, labor for Sampling staff to draw a sample of unselected teachers for a Fall 2016 data collection, and to prepare weights and estimates for that sample, has been included in the current cost estimate. The financial projections now extend to March 2017, and will require a no-cost time extension.
- No reduction in estimated costs for the video data storage and technical support is assumed.

District Recruitment

- District recruitment ended in mid-December.
- Principal recruitment ended in mid-February.

MQI Teacher Recruitment

- Teacher recruitment ended on March 18, 2016.

Cost
Jun 13, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	877,462.00
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	1,014,760.00
Total Budget:	1,230,225.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	61,657.00
Reason For Variance:	

- A \$199,557 total cost de-obligation of funds was processed and is now incorporated into the budget figures above. We have been told that if needed, re-obligating funds will not require permission from NSF.
- It is acknowledged that response rates are lower than anticipated. The current cost projection assumes completion of roughly 200 video sets (from 200 teachers.) The reduction in the assumption of completed video sets has reduced projected expenditures considerably.
- As noted above,

Projections
Jun 13, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	39,697.00
Actual Dollars Used:	18,178.00
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	21,518.00
Reason For Variance:	

Respondent payments, freight were lower than anticipated. EWB has not been charging projected expenses.

Measures

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

Other Measures

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

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

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

Principal Investigator/Client Megan Patrick (UM-SRC)

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

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SRO Project Period 08/2012 - 08/2017

Data Col Period 04/2016 - 08/2016

Security Plan Yes

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:

Pretest End:

Staffing Completed:

SS Train Start:

DC Start:

Pretest Start:

Recruitment Start:

GIT Start:

SS Train End:

DC End:

Other Project Team Members: Gina-Qian Yang Cheung, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Hueichun Peng, Andrew Piskorowski (years 1 & 2), (Aaron Pearson - year 1), Max Malhotra, Lloyd Hemingway

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

Report Period June, 2016 (MTF-WPSP Year 2/MTF III) **Project Phase** Implementing

Risk Level *Not Rated*

Monthly Update Training for NR calling was held June 16th, 2016 - with calling starting immediately after certification.

Planning has started for MTF Web 2017 - a meeting was held which included the PI and SPA on June 21st, 2016. The PI confirmed that texting was definitely a part of the scope for 2017 production.

Exploration of the options for texting, software and standards, began.

Special Issues

Cost
May 31, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	91,785.93
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	358,430.57
<i>Total Budget:</i>	377,934.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	19,503.43
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections
May 31, 2016

<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	29,688.69
<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	15,707.89
<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	13,980.80
<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	MTF Base Year Tablet Pilot (MTF Tablet Pilot)				
Project Mode	Primary: Class SAQ Total of Modes: 1				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 342,799.00	Indirect Budget: 188,540.00	Total Budget: 531,339.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Richard Miech (UM-SRC)				
Funding Agency	National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). Fall-only budget, direct: \$67,163.00; Indir:\$36,940.00; Total:\$104,103.00				
IRB	HUM#: N/A	Period Of Approval:	N/A		
Project Team	Project Lead: Meredith A House Budget Analyst: Christine Evanchek Production Manager: Barbara Aghababian-Homburg Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul Production Manager: Production Manager:				
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	The fall 2015 and spring 2016 tablet pilots will test the feasibility of moving from paper Scantron forms to a tablet-based application for the administration of MTF Base Year data collection. Two forms of 8th/10th grade MTF survey and two forms of the 12th grade MTF survey will be administered in two schools in the fall pilot and in eight schools in the spring pilot.				
SRO Project Period	06/2015 - 10/2016				
Data Col Period	10/2015 - 06/2016				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: 01/31/2016 SS Train Start: 04/25/2016 DC Start: 05/18/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 05/12/2016 DC End: 11/18/2016 </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: 01/31/2016 SS Train Start: 04/25/2016 DC Start: 05/18/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 05/12/2016 DC End: 11/18/2016
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: 01/31/2016 SS Train Start: 04/25/2016 DC Start: 05/18/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: 05/12/2016 DC End: 11/18/2016				
Other Project Team Members:	David Bolt (Technical Systems/Help desk), Lawrence Daher (Technical Systems/Help desk), Minako Edgar (Data Manager), Kyle Kwaiser (Technical Systems Lead/Data Manager), Paul Schulz (Survey Programmer) Note: Mike Nugent (SSL) is the field researcher for fall 2015. In spring 2016, MTF field staff will serve as FRs.				
Other Project Names:	MTF Fall 2015 Tablet Pilot MTF Spring 2016 Tablet Pilot				
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak				
Data Col Tool	Other (SurveyCTO)				
Hardware	Tablet				
DE Software	Other (Google Form)				
QC Recording Tool	N/A				
Incentive	Yes, R; Yes, Other (Schools)				
Administration	SRO Group				
Payment Type	Check, prepaid (\$1,000 (fall 2015 schools only)); Check, post (\$500 or \$1000 (spring-fall 2016 schools)); Cash,				
Payment Method	Check through other system (Rpay spreadsheet); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (Rpay spreadsh				

Report Period	June, 2016 (MTF Tablet Pilot)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

Monthly Update	June activities:
-----------------------	------------------

Barb, Meredith, Ginny and Richard attended the June 7 administrations in Romulus, MI. We held a debriefing with the spring FRs and helpers on June 14th. All in all, we were no surprised by the feedback we received; the field staff actually reported a more positive experience administering with the tablets than we had expected.

Meredith and Minako met with 2 of MTF's data processing staff to orient them to the tablet survey data and paradata in its raw form and the processing steps we take to get the data into clean, usable SAS files. Longer term (after the pilots), Richard would like the MTF data staff to take over the processing of the raw data. There will still be some steps SRO needs to take, such as creating the files that link the survey data to the 12th grade contact information

data. We'll also need to establish a process for documenting survey programming changes and how these impact data processing steps.

Despite having launched the pilot data collections, we continue to improve SHApp Encrypt and there is a newer release of SurveyCTO Collect containing a bug fix - before the fall pilot data collections we will update the tablets with these improvements/releases.

Special Issues

Cost		
Jun 30, 2016	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	531,339.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections		
Jun 30, 2016	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
	<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
	<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

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

Other Measures

Project Name	National Science Writing Survey (STEM)																				
Project Mode	Primary: Web Total of Modes: 1																				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects			Project Status	Current																
Budget	Direct Budget:	41,876.00	Indirect Budget:	23,032.00	Total Budget: 64,908.00																
Principal Investigator/Client	Anne Gere (University of Michigan School of Education)																				
Funding Agency	National Science Foundation																				
IRB	HUM#:	HUM000103280	Period Of Approval:	6/15/2015-6/15/2016																	
Project Team	Project Lead:	Zoanne Blackburn																			
	Budget Analyst:	Carl S Remmert																			
	Production Manager:	_UnAssigned																			
	Senior Project Advisor:	Kirsten Haakan Alcser																			
	Production Manager:	_UnAssigned																			
	Production Manager:	_UnAssigned																			
Proposal #:	no data																				
Description:	This project is a web survey of faculty members, designed to determine how many STEM-area (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) faculty are using writing in their classrooms; reasons for their decision (to use or not use writing in the classroom); and faculty beliefs about the importance of writing for learning. The sample will be provided by the project staff and will include faculty members at 80 research universities. The research team will obtain lists of eligible faculty from member universities. The total sample will be 15,000 faculty members, of which approximately 4,500 are expected to participate in the survey.																				
SRO Project Period	10/2015 - 06/2016																				
Data Col Period	01/2016 - 05/2016																				
Security Plan	NA																				
Milestone Dates	<table><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</td><td>Pretest Start:</td><td>01/04/2016</td></tr><tr><td>Pretest End:</td><td>02/06/2016</td><td>Recruitment Start:</td></tr><tr><td>Staffing Completed:</td><td>GIT Start:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>SS Train Start:</td><td>SS Train End:</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>DC Start:</td><td>03/30/2016</td><td>DC End:</td><td>05/02/2016</td></tr></table>					PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:	01/04/2016	Pretest End:	02/06/2016	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:		SS Train Start:	SS Train End:		DC Start:	03/30/2016	DC End:	05/02/2016
PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:	01/04/2016																			
Pretest End:	02/06/2016	Recruitment Start:																			
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:																				
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:																				
DC Start:	03/30/2016	DC End:	05/02/2016																		
Other Project Team Members:	Hueichun Peng, Laura Yoder, Shaowei Sun																				
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, 2016 (STEM)	Project Phase	Closing
Risk Level	On Track		
Monthly Update	<p>Dan Zahs is now consulting with PI's regarding analysis plan and has presented them some options regarding determining partial cases. This work may move the final data delivery to June/July. A partial data delivery was provided in May.</p>		
Special Issues	A contingency account was established for the additional work requested by PI.		

Cost
Jun 30, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	55,085.87
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	64,863.76
<i>Total Budget:</i>	64,908.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	44.24
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections
Jun 30, 2016

<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	9,777.89
<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	9,120.19
<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	657.89
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Measures			
	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<i>Current Goal:</i>	4500		
<i>Goal at Completion:</i>	4500		
<i>Current actual:</i>	4644		
<i>Estimate at Complete:</i>	5500		
<i>Variance:</i>			

Other Measures determination about paratials will increase completes, at end of data collection there were 2148 partial cases (data provided on completeness to PI).

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: 40,601,208.00										
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%;"> <tr> <td>PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011</td> <td>Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pretest End:</td> <td>Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011</td> <td>GIT Start: 09/13/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SS Train Start: 09/15/2011</td> <td>SS Train End: 09/19/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DC Start: 09/20/2011</td> <td>DC End: 07/01/2019</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011	Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011	GIT Start: 09/13/2011	SS Train Start: 09/15/2011	SS Train End: 09/19/2011	DC Start: 09/20/2011	DC End: 07/01/2019
PreProduction Start: 03/01/2011	Pretest Start:													
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/01/2011													
Staffing Completed: 08/17/2011	GIT Start: 09/13/2011													
SS Train Start: 09/15/2011	SS Train End: 09/19/2011													
DC Start: 09/20/2011	DC End: 07/01/2019													
Other Project Team Members:	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst, 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, 2016 (NSFG 2010-2020)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

Monthly Update	<p>Quarter 19 ended on June 18th. Cost-savings strategies were put into place during Q19 as NCHS alerted the project in March that funding was not available to cover the full cost-to-complete projected costs for the year. Strategies included eliminating, or reducing, overnight travel to assist with data collection in unstaffed or under-staffed areas and eliminating interviewer overtime. Three areas were monitored: costs, yield and response rate. Estimates on the effects on each of these key parameters were presented to NCHS and updates provided throughout the month. Costs were reduced as needed; the yield was impacted to a lesser degree than anticipated; the response rate was significantly lower than previous quarters. While the decision was made to hold sample back in specific unstaffed areas, there were other areas in which an interviewer attrited during the quarter and the sample was already released in the area.</p>
-----------------------	---

Given the reduction in overnight travel, the released but unworked sample negatively affected the response rate. These outcomes, as well as year 6 projected recruitment costs, were evaluated to plan for quarter 20. Year 6 interviewer recruitment and training plans are also underway. A security meeting is scheduled for June 29th to address ongoing issues with the security clearance process.

Special Issues

NCHS will not know the funding available for year 6 until October 2016. Given that this information will not be available until the start of the year, the ISR team will need to decide whether to proceed with the full sample design at the start of the year in mid-September, which means fielding and staffing all PSUs, or starting with a reduced field effort given the definite amount to be funded for year 6 (\$5,000,000).

Cost
Jun 15, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 24,571,853.01

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 43,828,756.01

Total Budget: 40,601,208.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): -3,227,548.01

Reason For Variance:

The HPI is 2 hours higher than originally budgeted. Interviewer attrition has been higher requiring more recruitment, training and travelling than originally estimated. Listing, sampling and sample monitoring is greater than originally anticipated. Help Desk hours are significantly higher than originally estimated. The target number of interviews increased in year 5 when the age range was expanded (although budget did not increase).

Projections
Jun 15, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 432,926.05

Actual Dollars Used: 378,255.82

Variance (Projected minus Actual): 54,670.23

Reason For Variance:

Interviewer travel and overtime were lower than projected given the restrictions put in place to reduce costs for the current year. Respondent payments were also lower due to the decreased rate of interviewing.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	1336	75%	9.0
Goal at Completion:	1250	70%	10.0
Current actual:	1151	63%	10.9
Estimate at Complete:	1151	63%	10.9
Variance:	185	12%	1.9

Other Measures

The goals and actuals shown above are the final results for Q19.

Project Name	Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior (AHRB)				
Project Mode	Primary: Class SAQ	Secondary: Web	Total of Modes: 2		
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 815,655.00	Indirect Budget: 452,688.00	Total Budget: 1,268,343.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Daniel Keating (U-M SRC)				
Funding Agency	Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of-National Institutes of Health				
IRB	HUM#: HUM00084650	Period Of Approval:	3/4/2015 - 3/3/2016		
Project Team	Project Lead: Meredith A House Budget Analyst: Dean E Stevens 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 - 01/2016				
Security Plan	Yes				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016 </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018 </td> </tr> </table>			PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018
PreProduction Start: Pretest End: Staffing Completed: SS Train Start: DC Start: 09/01/2016	Pretest Start: Recruitment Start: GIT Start: SS Train End: DC End: 05/31/2018				
Other Project Team Members:	Larry Daher, Emmanuel Ellis, David Bolt, Kyle Goodman, Donnalee Grey-Farquharson, Kyle Kwaiser (tech lead, data manager), Becky Loomis, Max Malhotra, Shaowei Sun, Laura Yoder (data management)				

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

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

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

Monthly Update	June activities:
-----------------------	------------------

We continued our technical planning for a simple portal for respondents to access their survey and neurocognitive tasks, and for modifications to SRIS for waves 2-3.

Primary areas of SRO scope increase that contribute to the overall projected overrun have been discussed with the PI. Meredith documented the increase in a formal scope change document. Accompanying the document, we submitted a base cost increase cost report (with original incentive plan) and two other cost estimates with options for increasing the incentive amounts. These were submitted to the client on June 8.

A significant amount of time was spent by Kyle, Becky and Meredith on the IRN amendment and R materials. The IRB amendment for waves 2- 3 was submitted on June 15. The full board review will take place July 6th.

Special Issues

Cost	Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	0.00
Jun 30, 2016	Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	0.00
	Total Budget:	1,268,343.00
	Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	0.00
	Reason For Variance:	
Projections	Dollars Projected For Month:	0.00
Jun 30, 2016	Actual Dollars Used:	0.00
	Variance (Projected minus Actual):	0.00
	Reason For Variance:	

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

Other Measures

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

Project Mode Primary: Telephone Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

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

Funding Agency

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

SRO Project Period 03/2015 - 12/2017

Data Col Period 07/2015 - 07/2017

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

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

Other Project

Team Members:

Other Project

Names:

Sample Mgmt Sys SMS

Data Col Tool NA

Hardware Desktop

DE Software NA

QC Recording Tool NA

Incentive NA

Administration NA

Payment Type NA

Payment Method NA

Report Period June, 2016 (YRS)

Project Phase Implementing

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update Interviewing continues to go well with three month and six month follow-ups. Still waiting to hear about increased funding for Study 2.

Special Issues

There has been compression of the timeline because of 1)late start of enrollemnt in ER's, 2)late IRB approval at some sites. The PI is expanding the number of cases for Study 1 and has put in a proposal to expand Study 2 through a supplement. PI needs this additional work completed without extending grant period so we anticipate a no cost extension (which might be 12 months). The additional cases for Study 1, as well as additional mailings are being done within current funds.

Cost
Jun 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 543,376.63
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 1,343,011.19
Total Budget: 1,423,227.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 1,840.81
Reason For Variance: Need to accumulate funds for potential no cost extension to complete data collection

Projections
Jun 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 43,701.28
Actual Dollars Used: 42,727.69
Variance (Projected minus Actual): 973.59
Reason For Variance:

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:	2191	85%	3.0
Goal at Completion:	4200	85%	3.0
Current actual:	2075	70%	1.2
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.

Project Name	PSID Web Explore Core (PSID All Stars)				
Project Mode	Primary: Web Total of Modes: 1				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current	
Budget	Direct Budget:	194,766.00	Indirect Budget:	108,096.00	Total Budget: 302,862.00
Principal Investigator/Client	Vicki Freedman (SRC-PSID) Kate McGonagle (SRC-PSID)				

Funding Agency					
IRB	HUM#:	N/A	Period Of Approval:		
Project Team	Project Lead:	Meredith A House			
	Budget Analyst:	Janelle P Cramer			
	Production Manager:				
	Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul			
	Production Manager:				
	Production Manager:				

Proposal #: no data

Description: Phase 2 of converting the PSID core instrument to web. Phase 2 will use Blaise 5 and MSMS.

SRO Project Period 09/2014 - 08/2016

Data Col Period 06/2016 - 08/2016

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:
DC Start: 07/05/2016	DC End: 08/12/2016

Other Project Team Members: Jennie Williams = Data management; Youhong Liu/Peter Sparks = Blaise programming, Pam Swanson = MSMS set up; Jeff Smith = TSG oversight; Max Malhotra = Portal programming; Jim Rodgers and Gina Cheung = MSMS/integration leadership

Other Project Names: PSID Webinizing Phase 2
PSID Conversion to Web

Sample Mgmt Sys MSMS

Data Col Tool Blaise 5

Hardware Other (R Hardware)

DE Software N/A

QC Recording Tool N/A

Incentive Yes, R

Administration SRO Group; ISR Group (PSID)

Payment Type Check, prepaid (100); Other (\$10 Amazon gift card)

Payment Method Check through other system (PSID RAPS); Other (Amazon gift cards)

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

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update PSID All Stars Progress Update 06/06/2016
Note that we are back on track in all areas. However, the overall timeline is still tight.

****Blaise Instrument Programming/Testing - On track**

The instrument has been tested to spec, what remain are 27 new or not yet fixed items for the programmer to address. There are about 44 items that have been marked "ready to test." Blaise 5 build 964 was installed and testing began on 6/1. Mary, Andrea, Youhong, Jeff and Meredith held a meeting to check up on instrument status on Thursday 6/2. Resources will be focused on testing over the next 2 weeks, are we are targeting June 17th to have all issues cleaned up.

A request for renaming (for consistency) of some Blaise servers for All Stars testing and production, and the set-up of

2 new QA servers was placed with CMT. The work was completed by Monday 6/6. These servers had to be in place before integrated testing or production could occur -> a server mapping meeting has been scheduled for Tues 6/7 in preparation for integration testing.

****Blaise 5 Server Events and SRO Session Services - On track**

Server events are working in Blaise 5.0.5.954. The decision has been made to move forward with build 954 for integration testing with MSMS and All Stars production.

****MSMS - On track**

The version of MSMS (2016.4.1.103) that is scheduled to be user for All Stars passed QA and was promoted to the TestNext environment on June 3rd. Integration testing is to be carried out this week (6/6-6/10) with MSMS "test 4" project. This version of MSMS is scheduled to be promoted to production on June 13th.

****SRO Blaise 5 Portal Services - On track**

Per last week's discussion (Kate, Mary and Meredith), for anyone "blocked" from the survey (either because their survey is completed or their survey task has been cancelled), we adjusted the portal message to be more generic to suit multiple situations. The message now reads, "This survey is no longer available. You may have already completed the survey. If you have any questions, please contact us at..." This resolves outstanding item #4.

Item #5 – work on capturing and presenting data related to login attempts continues, but is making good progress.

****Reports and Data Deliverables - On track**

The remaining MSMS views for testing were delivered 6/1. Mushtaq and Jennie exchanged a few emails with questions/requests for changes. Test Blaise data will be available as a result of the integration testing.

****Other Production Prep Work - On track**

Work on draft R communications is slightly behind, but not a cause for concern. During the week of 5/23, progress was made on procedures for the Amazon gift cards.

PSID All Stars Progress Update 06/15/2016

****Blaise Instrument Programming/Testing - On track**

The instrument has been tested to spec, what remain are 13 new or not yet fixed items for the programmer to address. There are a couple of new items Mary found that Andrea will add to CTT today. There are about 8 items that have been marked "ready to test." A lot of headway was made in the past week. We are still on target for having all issues cleaned up by June 17th.

Web and Blaise 5 server mapping has been decided and documented. With these in place, we were able to start integration testing (portal, Blaise 5 survey, MSMS, data out) the latter part of the week of 6/6.

****Blaise 5 Server Events and SRO Session Services - On track**

No changes since last week's update. Server events are working in Blaise 5.0.5.964. The decision has been made to move forward with build 964 for integration testing with MSMS and All Stars production.

****MSMS - On track**

As we set up for integration testing with the MSMS "test 4" project at the beginning of the week (of 6/6), we discovered there was a variable name mismatch that caused MSMS to not be able to talk to the Authentication Service and update the case status accordingly. After a couple of days, we figured out that there is one mapping table that is only populated once and does not get updated subsequently. Once we found that out, we were able to reset things and re-populate it with the correct login ID values that allowed us to update the Authentication Service. This problem was diagnosed on Thursday 6/9, and we were able to start integration testing on Friday 6/10.

This version of MSMS is now scheduled to be promoted to production on June 20th.

6/14 we determined we will need a second round of integration testing early next week. We wish to complete a round of testing with the final instrument before promoting to production. The current plan is to carry out integration test 2 6/20-6/21 and production "smoke tests" 6/22-6/23.

****SRO Blaise 5 Portal Services - On track**

Item #5 – work on capturing and presenting data related to login attempts - data is being captured, data managers are in process of verifying. Note that these data are new to SRO and projects. SRO will be able to provide these data for the All Stars project, and the format for this deliverable will be refined over time as projects use the portal and data. The All Stars team will work with PSID staff to provide a meaningful deliverable while being mindful of project scope and budget.

****Reports and Data Deliverables - On track**

As output from the integration testing, the payment data, MSMS views and test Blaise data will be delivered to PSID for further familiarization and testing. We estimate this data will be available to PSID staff Thursday, 6/16.

****Other Production Prep Work - On track**

R communications have been drafted and reviewed by Kate. Kate provided some edits. Regarding the plan for Amazon gift cards – in our Monday tech team meeting, we outlined –

- Meredith sets up imprest cash account for max amount
 - Imprest cash withdrawal to purchase Visa gift card for purchasing 100 Amazon cards
 - Meredith purchases 100 Amazon cards and gives them to PSID staff for distribution with checks
 - We are planning to affix the Amazon card with a glue dot to 1/3 sheet of card stock for insertion into window envelope with the check.
 - Imprest cash withdrawal to purchase Visa gift card for purchasing remaining Amazon cards (exact amount TBD – 250 + a few extra (??))
 - Meredith purchases remaining Amazon cards and gives them to PSID staff for distribution with checks
 - Meredith reconcile imprest cash account
-

PSID All Stars Progress Update 06/21/2016

Production launch date has been moved to 7/5/2016

****Blaise Instrument Programming/Testing - On track**

Data model was signed off 6/20/2016, but upon entering a few complete test cases into the final data model (so Mushtaq can review the data and test Blaise 5 extraction) a few more screen errors were found. Youhong has fixed them and they are being tested today 6/21. Due to the nature of the errors, we decided this should not hold up moving forward with the second round of integration testing.

****Blaise 5 Server Events and SRO Session Services - On track**

No changes.

****MSMS - On track**

Despite a few screen errors found in the final data model, we are setting up for a second round of integration testing early this week with the MSMS "Test 5" project. We wish to complete a round of testing with the final instrument before promoting to production. The current plan is to carry out integration test 2 6/21-6/23.

The version of MSMS being used for All Stars was promoted to production 6/20. Our plan is to confirm the production environment is ready by June 30.

****SRO Blaise 5 Portal Services - On track**

No changes.

****Reports and Data Deliverables - On track**

There has been a slight delay in the delivery of output from integration test 1 (MSMS test 4). Today 6/20, Jennie is in the middle of processing the payment data, MSMS views and test Blaise data, which will be delivered to PSID for further familiarization and testing. In processing, she will further automate where possible and get a better idea of how long it takes. The Summary Report with key status indicators is now also available. We estimate this data will be available to PSID staff Tuesday, 6/21.

****Other Production Prep Work - On track**

Meredith is working with an SSA on ordering mailing envelopes and to set-up the imprest cash fund.

PSID All Stars Progress Update 06/27/2016

Production launch date has been moved to 7/5/2016

****Overall Status update - On track**

- Payment data, MSMS views, test Blaise data, and Summary Report with key status indicators from the first integration test using MSMS project test 4 were delivered to PSID for further familiarization and testing on 6/21.
- Second sign off of the data model (final final) occurred 6/22/2016. This was still in time to be able to incorporate into the 2nd round of integration testing with MSMS project test 5. We started that testing 6/22 and promptly found one problem with a portal redirect. This was fixed by midday Thursday and testing got underway again. A number of us have been working our way through the various portal, instrument and MSMS scenarios. So far, so good. We are

trying to get through all scenarios before 1 pm on Monday 6/27, which is when our task rules for project close-out are scheduled to run.

- There is one known portal issue - small mobile devices (Android) are not being blocked when using Firefox (they are blocked using Chrome and IE and iPhones are blocked using Safari). It appears to be particular to Firefox. Meredith would like to check with the PIS to see if they consider this a show-stopper. Further investigation into solving this issue would most likely delay our launch at least by a day or two. Given that it is a situation only on small mobile devices using one browser, it's likely not to affect many people. And it isn't preventing a person from accessing the survey, it's allowing. For these reasons, Meredith recommends this not delay our launch.
- Seven complete test cases in the final data model were delivered on 6/22 so PSID staff could review the data and test Blaise 5 extraction.
- Jennie will load preload 5 production data lines into the final data model on 6/27 for PSID to test the production preload.
- On Tuesday 6/28, we will set-up the current versions of MSMS, the portal and the instrument in the "Test Current" environment which is identical to the production environment. We'll load sample there for the SSL 800 line training and to be used as needed for troubleshooting.
- Wednesday 6/29, will be our production configuration and "smoke test." Our goal is to have this completed and accepted Wednesday so production sample can be loaded and ready to go on Thursday 6/30.
- Payment data, MSMS views, test Blaise data, and Summary Report with key status indicators from the second integration test using MSMS project test 5 should be available by Wednesday 6/29.
- SSL 800 line training is planned for Thursday 6/30.
- Envelopes have been ordered and should arrive this week. Imprest cash fund request has been placed, we are just waiting to hear it has been established. We will purchase postage this week.
- As soon as the imprest cash fund is established, Meredith will purchase a \$1,000 Visa card to purchase the first 100 Amazon gift cards.

Special Issues

Carrying a significant overrun - since before All Stars phase (phase 2 of webinizing). Remaining projections are slim and there is still a lot of integration work/testing to do with Blaise 5, MSMS and the portal. Team members have been necessarily spending more time than was budgeted in order to accomplish the scope. We've set up a contingency account for the additional hours needed to launch and complete the All Stars pilot project. The additional hours estimate is 255.

Cost Jun 30, 2016

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

Projections Jun 30, 2016

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

Measures

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

Other Measures

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

Report Period	June, 2016 (PSID-WB)	Project Phase	Implementing
----------------------	----------------------	----------------------	--------------

Risk Level *Not Rated*

Monthly Update May work included:

- On-going PAPI Logging and Data Entry by SSL staff
- On-going non-response reminder calling by SSL interviewers
- Continued updates to data delivery, including additional elements of the SMS subset
- Mailings were sent to both web and choice groups during the month of May
- Several new experiments were conducted - including texting and emailing to random groups.

Special Issues

Cost
May 30, 2016

<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	488,779.36
<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	685,073.97
<i>Total Budget:</i>	706,428.00
<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	21,354.03
<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

Projections
May 30, 2016

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

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

Other Measures

Project Name	Social Networks and Well Being (SN&WB)													
Project Mode	Primary: Face to Face Secondary: Telephone													
Project Type	Sponsored Projects		Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget:	516,716.00	Indirect Budget:	284,195.00 Total Budget: 800,911.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Kira Birdett (University of Michigan) Karen Fingerman (University of Texas at Austin)													
Funding Agency														
IRB	HUM#:	2015-02-0123	Period Of Approval:	4/15/16-4/15/17										
Project Team	Project Lead:	Heidi Marie Guyer												
	Budget Analyst:													
	Production Manager:	Kathleen S Ladronka												
	Senior Project Advisor:	Kirsten Haakan Alcser												
	Production Manager:	Russell W Stark												
	Production Manager:	Esther H Ullman												
Proposal #:	no data													
Description:	<p>SRO will screen and invite 500 adults over 65 years of age residing in Austin, TX to complete an in-person interview and follow up assessments. The primary aims of this study are to examine the effects of members of one's social network versus others encountered in terms of the quality of the relationship as well as physical, emotional and cognitive functions associated with social interactions among adults older than 65 residing in the Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area.</p> <p>The screening interview will be conducted in the Survey Services Lab (SSL). The main interview will be conducted in person in the respondent's home by local field staff. The main interview will collect information on demographic characteristics, social networks, and emotional, cognitive and physical functioning including walking speed and grip strength. At the end of the main interview, the interviewer will instruct the respondent on using an Android device (smartphone) programmed with the Electronically Activated Recorder (EAR) and daily surveys (mobile-ecological momentary assessment: mEMA) as well as a microphone for the recordings and a wrist Actigraph. The interviewer will explain the instructions for each of the three monitoring systems: EAR, mEMA and the Actigraph. Participants will use the 3 devices during a 4-day (intensive) data collection period starting on a Thurs, Fri or Sat to encompass 2 weekend days and 2 weekdays. The interviewer will leave the devices and instructions with the respondent and schedule a time to return to pick them up after the 4-day period. The interviewer will also leave a self-administered paper questionnaire with the respondent. The respondent will be instructed to complete the questionnaire on their own and return it to the University of Texas. The interviewer will also be responsible for daily reminder/troubleshooting calls to the respondent.</p>													
SRO Project Period	01/2016 - 04/2017													
Data Col Period														
Security Plan	NA													
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest Start:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Pretest End:</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">GIT Start: 08/27/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train Start: 08/29/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">SS Train End: 09/01/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC Start: 09/06/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DC End: 01/31/2017</td> </tr> </table>				PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016	Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016	GIT Start: 08/27/2016	SS Train Start: 08/29/2016	SS Train End: 09/01/2016	DC Start: 09/06/2016	DC End: 01/31/2017
PreProduction Start: 01/01/2016	Pretest Start:													
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start: 06/15/2016													
Staffing Completed: 07/25/2016	GIT Start: 08/27/2016													
SS Train Start: 08/29/2016	SS Train End: 09/01/2016													
DC Start: 09/06/2016	DC End: 01/31/2017													
Other Project Team Members:	Karl Dinkelmann, Marsha Skoman, Lisa Quist, Holly Ackerman, Dan Zahs, Paul Burton, Grace Tison, Suzanne Hodge													
Other Project Names:	Daily Experiences and Well-Being (DEWS)													
Sample Mgmt Sys	SurveyTrak													
Data Col Tool	Blaise 4.8; SAQ; Other (mEMA and EAR app on Android, Actical)													
Hardware	Laptop; Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (Android device, Actical device)													
DE Software	NA													
QC Recording Tool	DRI-CARI; Live monitoring													
Incentive	Yes, R													
Administration	NA													
Payment Type	Cash, prepaid (\$1); Cash, post (\$50 + \$100)													
Payment Method	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office													

Report Period June, 2016 (SN&WB) **Project Phase** Initiation

Risk Level *Some Concerns*

Monthly Update The activities in the month of June have included technical developments, multiple meetings with the PIs and vendors of the various software that will be utilized on the project to collect ancillary data, determining a preliminary hiring, staffing, training and data collection plan and schedule for both the SSL and field staff, and completing standard project documentation (budget projections, project charter, project scope, etc). As planned in June the focus was on testing the various systems, especially the Blaise screener and main, finalizing the recruitment and hiring schedule and the training schedule. The decision was made that it would be best to delay the training since the programming of the additional components by the vendors is taking longer than anticipated and the complexity of the project will require careful training planning.

Special Issues The original budget for this project did not include a pretest. It would be extremely beneficial to hold a pretest prior to production given the high respondent burden and the number and complexity of the technical systems. We are determining whether this will be feasible. The PI has proposed adding several new components to the project: an SAQ, taking a picture in the respondent's home, increasing the number of days of data collection, and collecting dried blood spots. There are also discussions taking place regarding the sample design (exclusion of cell phones, possibility of convenience sample, Austin MSA vs Travis County, etc).

Cost
Jun 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):	43,504.78
Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):	788,761.18
Total Budget:	800,911.00
Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):	11,683.19
Reason For Variance:	Projections will be updated for QC activities and other tasks.

Projections
Jun 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month:	56,932.39
Actual Dollars Used:	33,556.99
Variance (Projected minus Actual):	23,375.40
Reason For Variance:	The month of May was the beginning of programming, development and testing. Due to other components from vendors not not ready (mEMA) less programming testing of phone could start

Measures	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:	300		8.8
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:			
Variance:			

Other Measures Goal: Identify 500 eligible respondents via telephone screener, 350 agree to complete interview, 300 complete main interview and all additional components (EAR, mEMA, Actical) for full duration.

Project Name	Surveys of Consumer Attitudes (SCA 2016)				
Project Mode	Primary: Telephone Total of Modes: 1				
Project Type	Sponsored Projects	Project Status	Current		
Budget	Direct Budget: 697,302.00	Indirect Budget: 0.00	Total Budget: 697,302.00		
Principal Investigator/Client	Dr. Richard T. Curtin (SRC)				
Funding Agency	Bloomberg, others for Riders.				
IRB	HUM#:	Period Of Approval:			
Project Team	Project Lead:	Joseph Matthew Matuzak			
	Budget Analyst:	Dean E Stevens			
	Production Manager:				
	Senior Project Advisor:	Mary P Maher			
	Production Manager:				
	Production Manager:				
Proposal #:	no data				
Description:	<p>The monthly Surveys of Consumers are a series of nationally representative surveys with households in the contiguous United States. The SCA is designed to measure changes in consumer attitudes and expectations.</p> <p>The objectives of the surveys are to learn what consumers think about economic events under varying circumstances and to determine why they think and behave as they do. Since changes in attitudes and expectations occur in advance of behavior, measures of consumer attitudes and expectations can act as leading indicators of aggregate economic activity. The survey measures are not intended to establish the absolute level of consumer sentiment at any given time. The SCA is intended to measure change. Each month the SSL interviewing staff obtains 500 interviews.</p>				
SRO Project Period	01/2016 - 12/2016				
Data Col Period	01/2016 - 12/2016				
Security Plan	NA				
Milestone Dates	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="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 Kelley Popielarz Pamela Swanson Jennie Williams LaVelvet Harrison				
Other Project Names:					
Sample Mgmt Sys	NA				
Data Col Tool	NA				
Hardware	NA				
DE Software	NA				
QC Recording Tool	NA				
Incentive	NA				
Administration	NA				
Payment Type	NA				
Payment Method	NA				
Report Period	June, 2016 (SCA 2016)	Project Phase	Implementing		
Risk Level	Some Concerns				
Monthly Update	SCA struggled throughout its June study month, running late for the first time since March 2013. We were unable to reach our expanded goal of 540 completed interviews, ending instead with 525, with a 355 RDDs and 170 Recons.				

This month's instrument was long, at 33.8 minutes in length. We had a difficult prelim, with only 300 completes and a poor split, and continued struggling throughout the month, posting the highest HPI we have had since transitioning to cell phone, at 3.84. Our response rate also fell, with a total of 9%, RDDs at 6% and Recons at 50%. All this struggle was costly, as we used a large number of interviewer hours for production, with a total of 2013.6. Much of this was due to the relative inexperience of our interviewing crew, which showed in their lack of success turning contacts into completed interviews. Unfortunately, we also needed to put our TLs and QC team on the phones as much as possible in order to finish the study, and this meant little time to focus on improving the skills of those newer team member. This is something we will focus on in July.

Special Issues**Cost**

Jun 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 302,528.39**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 728,088.67**Total Budget:** 697,302.00**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -30,786.67**Reason For Variance:**

We remain under budget at this point, but the scope change from 500 to 600 completed interviews over the course of the year will push us beyond our current budget, which was created to reflect 500 per month.

Projections

Jun 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 60,678.00**Actual Dollars Used:** 0.24**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** -1,035.22**Reason For Variance:**

We experienced an unusually high HPI this month, and needed to add a great deal of additional hours simply to hit our old 500 complete goal. Pushing forward toward 540 added still more cost.

Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
Current Goal:			
Goal at Completion:	540	10	2.8
Current actual:			
Estimate at Complete:	525	9	3.84
Variance:	-15	-1	1.04

Other Measures

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

Project Mode Primary: Web Total of Modes: 1

Project Type Sponsored Projects **Project Status** Current

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

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

Funding Agency

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

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

Proposal #: no data

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

SRO Project Period 07/2015 - 06/2016

Data Col Period 10/2015 - 11/2015

Security Plan NA

Milestone Dates

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

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

Other Project Names: Campus Sustainability

Sample Mgmt Sys Illume

Data Col Tool Illume

Hardware NA

DE Software N/A

QC Recording Tool N/A

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

Administration SRO Group

Payment Type Other (Amazon gift code)

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

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

Risk Level On Track

Monthly Update June '16

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

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

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

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

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

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

To Do:

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

May '16

Work in May included:

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

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

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

-Andrew H. and Minako were asked to submit abstracts for an international sustainability conference to be held at ISR next May. Andrew H., Heather and Andrew P., worked on a set of methodological abstracts.

To Do:

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

April '16

Work in April included:

-Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.

-Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (AAPOR and IFDTC abstracts were accepted).

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

-Minako discovered an issue with a new question programmed in the 2015 survey. It was similar to a question in prior years. The similar question also remained in the survey. During programming the new question was programmed using the original variable names and the previous question was assigned new variable names by mistake. The variables were renamed in the 2015 dataset to be consistent with prior years.

-Andrew revised the questionnaires to fix the above variable naming issue and provided to the PI to post on the Graham website.

To Do:

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

March '16

Work in March included:

-Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.

-Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (AAPOR and IFDTC abstracts were accepted).

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

-Minako discovered an issue with a new question programmed in the 2015 survey. It was similar to a question in prior years. The similar question also remained in the survey. During programming the new question was programmed

using the original variable names and the previous question was assigned new variable names by mistake. The variables were renamed in the 2015 dataset to be consistent with prior years.

To Do:

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

February '16

Work in February included:

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

To Do:

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

January '16

Work in January included:

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

To do:

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

December '15

Work in December included:

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

To do:

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

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

2. Continuing to analyze data (experiments, e-mail, device usage, etc.).
3. Work with research team on appending other data sources to survey data.
4. Sample weights (Dan Z.)
5. Purchase gift codes.
6. Notify raffle winners.
7. Reconcile imprest cash account.

November '15

Work in November included:

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

To do:

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

October '15

Work in October included:

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

To do:

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

September '15

Work in September included:

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

To do:

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

Aug. '15

Work in August included:

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

To do:

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

July '15

Work in July included:

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

To do:

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

Special Issues

Cost

Jun 30, 2016

Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect): 48,356.21

Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC): 56,892.52

Total Budget: 69,535.00

Variance (Budget minus E\$AC): 12,642.48

Reason For Variance:

Unused data manager hours accounted for the underrun in April. There is an open discussion with the PI about using the unused funds for some analysis in the next fiscal year.

Projections

Jun 30, 2016

Dollars Projected For Month: 8,536.31

Actual Dollars Used: 0.00

Variance (Projected minus Actual): 0.00

Reason For Variance:

May '16 - Unused projections moved forward.

April '16 - Unused projections moved forward.

March '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.

February '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures

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

Other Measures