

# ***Survey Research Operations***

## ***Monthly Project Report***

### ***Sponsored Projects***

***July 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*  
*(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*

<b>Project Name</b>	Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mixed	Secondary: Mixed	Total of Modes: 2										
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b> Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 277,805.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 0.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 430,596.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Mary Heitzeg (UM Dept of Psychiatry)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	NIH												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM00106316	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	9/10/2015-1/7/2017										
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Karin Schneider <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Janelle P Cramer <b>Production Manager:</b> _UnAssigned <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Stephanie A Chardoul <b>Production Manager:</b> _UnAssigned <b>Production Manager:</b> _UnAssigned												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.)</p>												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	05/2016 - 03/2018												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	05/2016 - 02/2018												
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 05/15/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Recruitment Start:</b> 05/20/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Staffing Completed:</b> 05/20/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>GIT Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train End:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC Start:</b> 05/20/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC End:</b> 02/28/2018</td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 05/15/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 05/20/2016	<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 05/20/2016	<b>GIT Start:</b>	<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>	<b>DC Start:</b> 05/20/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 02/28/2018
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 05/15/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 05/20/2016												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 05/20/2016	<b>GIT Start:</b>												
<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>												
<b>DC Start:</b> 05/20/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 02/28/2018												
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>													
<b>Other Project Names:</b>	Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development												
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	NA												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	NA												
<b>Hardware</b>	NA												
<b>DE Software</b>	NA												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	NA												
<b>Incentive</b>	NA												
<b>Administration</b>	NA												
<b>Payment Type</b>	NA												
<b>Payment Method</b>	NA												

---

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (ABCD)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	On Track		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	July was a month of little activity due to schools being out for the summer. We did reach out to one district and received an initial refusal, but we will re-approach in the coming months. Respondent contact cards trickled and we		

are at a 4% response rate (goal is 10%). Costs incurred this past month are due to printing charges from UM Print Services coming through.

**Special Issues**

None

**Cost**

Jul 31, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	14,237.00
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	430,600.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	430,596.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	0.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	NA

**Projections**

Jul 31, 2016

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

**Measures**

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	54	.10	
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	54	.10	
<b>Current actual:</b>	3	.04	
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	54	.10	
<b>Variance:</b>			

**Other Measures**

HPI not applicable to this study.

<b>Project Name</b>	Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers-Longitudinal Study (A-STARRS LS)			
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Web	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 3	
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	8,218,215.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	4,520,018.00
			<b>Total Budget:</b>	12,738,233.00
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	James Wagner (University of Michigan) Robert Ursano (Uniformed Services University of the Health Scienc) Murray Stein (University of California San Diego)			
<b>Funding Agency</b>	Department of Defense			
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	HUM00099203	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	2/18/2016-2/17/2017
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Nancy J Gebler		
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>	William Lokers		
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Ruth B Philippou		
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Mary P Maher		
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Margaret Lee Hudson		
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Andrew L Hupp		

**Proposal #:** no data

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

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

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

**Security Plan** NA

**Milestone Dates**

**PreProduction Start:** 02/01/2015  
**Pretest End:** 03/31/2016  
**Staffing Completed:**  
**SS Train Start:**  
**DC Start:** 08/08/2016

**Pretest Start:** 10/14/2015  
**Recruitment Start:**  
**GIT Start:**  
**SS Train End:**  
**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** July, 2016 (A-STARRS LS) **Project Phase** Implementing

**Risk Level** Some Concerns

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

Project Management and Planning:

- The IRB amendment containing final production protocols and recruitment materials was approved at UM and has been submitted to USUHS for secondary IRB review.
- The start of data collection has been delayed due to IRB approvals taking longer than expected. The new

projected start is 12 September. This assumes USUHS IRB approval is received by the end of August and the Army takes two weeks to spin up its outreach and public relations efforts.

- The UM IRB administrator has questions about the IRB amendment and Individual Investigator Agreement needed for receipt of the GAT data. We have scheduled a meeting for August 2 to discuss the questions with the ODUSA staff and the AAG IRB administrator.
- We continue to track and report on our various requests to the Army. We sent a reminder this month asking for formal Army approval of the data collection protocols, and have been informed that the approval memos should arrive in the next few days.
- We prepared documentation on the preliminary response rate and cost assumptions for the Wave 1 contact protocol, and met with USUHS and Harvard to discuss. We are developing reports to allow us to closely monitor these assumptions and will work with the PIs to make adjustments to study protocols based on the data collection results.
- We worked on adjustments to our staffing plan and cost projections as team members are assigned to other projects or leave the organization.

#### Enclave and User Support:

- Members of the Enclave IT team continued to work on the checklist of items for the annual security review. We expect to complete the checklist and submit it to Army Analytics Group in late July or early August.
- A memo explaining the data storage platforms at Michigan was submitted to the Army, in an attempt to clear up confusion regarding our request for transferring survey data to Flux.
- We have received a request to develop a non-governmental ATO (Authority to Operate) for the servers holding our sample address files. This request will be addressed after we have completed work on the annual security review.
- We completed training new staff for laptop preparation and shipped an analyst laptop to Dr. Jain at UCSD. The rest of the requested laptops will be prepared and shipped in the near future.
- We are training replacement staff to manage security and biomarker support activities.
- 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 June 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 a projected September start date.
- We are revising the assumptions for the SOF ballpark, to try to reduce the total cost for this proposed supplement.

#### Technical Systems Development, Programming

- We continued testing the end-game web instrument program, and worked with the vendor on programming the IVR version.
- We are working with the vendor to incorporate the recorded messages and IVR systems with our systems at Michigan.
- We continued work on our sample management system and integrating this system with the latest version of Blaise.
- We continued the development of data collection reports that will be used to monitor production data collection progress and evaluate the cost and response rate assumptions.

#### Data Collection Progress and Plans:

- The start of data collection has been rescheduled to September 12, to allow time for IRB review and Army outreach activities.
- Interviewer and team leader training has been rescheduled for September.
- We continue to transfer sample replicates to the ODUSA contractors, and receive address updates as they complete the manual lookups.
- We received recorded messages from the Sergeant Major of the Army, and the Command Sergeant Majors of the Guard and Reserve.

#### 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 \$155,908 in June 2016 on pre-production planning, programming and testing, hiring and training, and enclave support activities.

We are currently projecting a surplus of \$7,370 for the total project (less than 0.1% of the total budget), increasing projected total costs by \$27,742 from last month's report. Staffing changes due to attrition have had a small impact on our costs as we reassign tasks and train new team members. We also updated our cost estimates to reflect the later start date for production data collection. 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 June 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 May 2016		\$520,793	\$32,681	\$195,624	\$223,700
	Actual costs for June 2016		\$58,990	\$20,091	\$40,223	\$36,604
	Projected costs July-Nov		\$248,097	\$590,811	\$204,538	\$270,938
	Year 2 projected total cost		\$827,880	\$643,583	\$440,386	\$531,241
	Variance (\$253,757)		\$1,333,383	\$22,542	\$87,607	\$1,189,775
Year 3	Budget	\$400,008	\$1,981,395	\$476,249	\$603,408	\$3,461,060
	Year 3 projected total cost		\$416,888	\$2,404,547	\$451,763	\$591,573
	Variance (\$16,880)		(\$423,152)	\$24,486	\$11,835	(\$403,712)
Year 4	Budget	\$280,594	\$1,055,329	\$410,278	\$654,463	\$2,400,664
	Year 4 projected total cost		\$338,686	\$1,480,932	\$386,992	\$638,541
	Variance (\$58,092)		(\$425,603)	\$23,286	\$15,922	(\$444,487)
Year 5	Budget	\$263,619	\$805,264	\$418,806	\$636,637	\$2,124,326
	Year 5 projected total cost		\$309,934	\$1,217,946	\$391,615	\$616,445
	Variance (\$46,315)		(\$412,682)	\$27,191	\$20,192	(\$411,615)
Total Budget		\$2,088,910	\$5,874,656	\$2,015,689	\$2,758,978	\$12,738,233
Total Projected Cost at Completion			\$2,397,254	\$5,765,798	\$1,966,395	\$2,601,416
Total Variance		(\$308,344)	\$108,858	\$49,294	\$157,562	\$7,370

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

\*\*Data Collection costs for Wave 1 are primarily in Years 1-3; and Wave 2 are Years 4-5.

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

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

- SOF ballpark budget.
  - o We have been asked to use the preliminary STARRS Wave 1 response rate and cost assumptions to reduce the cost estimate for the SOF ballpark budget. These assumptions are rough guesses, and may be subject to a large amount of variance.
  - o Our experience with Special Forces units in AAS was that they were quite challenging to schedule. In addition, only 57% of the Special Forces Soldiers in AAS units completed an AAS interview, compared with 74% for the total AAS sample. If the data show the STARRS-LS assumptions to be too optimistic for this population, we run the risk of being able to afford a much smaller number of interviews with the available budget.
- Respondent participation.
  - o As mentioned above, we have created some preliminary estimates of response rates for each phase of the contact protocol. We will release the sample in replicates (random sub-samples). This will allow us to evaluate our results throughout data collection and make adjustments to optimize the cost and production.
- Locating respondents.
  - o The ODUSA staff is providing home address and telephone numbers from Army records. 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 are submitting 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 The contact protocol outlined by Harvard contains several innovative techniques, and is quite complicated. The IRB delay will be put to good use with additional development and testing to ensure that the systems are as robust as possible before we begin data collection.
- 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.
- IRB approvals, and production delays
  - o We have been experiencing increased IRB review times at both Michigan and USUHS. This has resulted in a delay in the start of production data collection, and also means we will have to plan much farther ahead for any changes that we want to implement.
  - o Because we do not know precisely when USUHS IRB approval will be received, we are adding two weeks to the calendar to give the Army time to finalize its outreach materials and coordinate the public relations campaign prior to the start of data collection.
- Background checks.
  - o We continue to experience long wait times for background checks. This impacts new analysts hired for work on STARRS, who must have a background check before they are given Enclave access.
  - o We have experienced some staff attrition and are working on getting their replacements through the background check process (required for work on STARRS analyst laptops and providing drop box support). The delays in the background checks for our new team members have resulted in some service delays.
  - 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  
Jul 31, 2016**

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	2,170,615.00
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	12,730,863.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	12,738,233.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	7,370.00

**Reason For Variance:**

The variance is currently less than 0.1% of the total budget. We continue to adjust our projections on a monthly basis, and will keep our variance at or near zero by the time the project ends. It is still early in the project, and we are still negotiating the timing and scope for our production data collection activities.

**Projections  
Jul 31, 2016**

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	182,365.00
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	155,908.00
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	26,457.00

**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**

<b>Project Name</b>	Becoming A Man 2 (BAM2)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Face to Face      Total of Modes: 1												
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 1,263,231.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 675,224.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 1,938,455.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Jens Ludwig (University of Chicago)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	NIH												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>											
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Sarah Crane <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Christine Evanchek <b>Production Manager:</b> Barbara Aghababian-Homburg <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Nicole G Kirgis <b>Production Manager:</b> Hongyu Johnson <b>Production Manager:</b>												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	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.												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	06/2015 - 05/2016												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	11/2015 - 04/2016												
<b>Security Plan</b>	Yes												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>PreProduction Start:</b></td> <td><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td><b>Recruitment Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Staffing Completed:</b></td> <td><b>GIT Start:</b> 11/01/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>SS Train Start:</b> 11/03/2015</td> <td><b>SS Train End:</b> 11/06/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DC Start:</b> 11/08/2015</td> <td><b>DC End:</b> 04/29/2016</td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>	<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b> 11/01/2015	<b>SS Train Start:</b> 11/03/2015	<b>SS Train End:</b> 11/06/2015	<b>DC Start:</b> 11/08/2015	<b>DC End:</b> 04/29/2016
<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b> 11/01/2015												
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 11/03/2015	<b>SS Train End:</b> 11/06/2015												
<b>DC Start:</b> 11/08/2015	<b>DC End:</b> 04/29/2016												
<b>Other Project</b>	Jeff Smith      SurveyTrak												
<b>Team Members:</b>	Holly Ackerman      WebTrak/WebLog/reports Jim Hagerman      CAI Minako Edgar      Data Manager Shaowei Sun      SRIS Andrea Pierce/Larry Daher      Help Desk Remediating Academic and Non-Academic Skills Deficit Among Disadvantaged Youth												
<b>Other Project Names:</b>													
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak; Other (SRIS)												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Blaise 4.8; Other (PAPI math assessment)												
<b>Hardware</b>	Laptop; Paper and Pencil; Other (barcode scanners)												
<b>DE Software</b>	Blaise 4.8 BIA ; Other (post collection transcription from audio files)												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	DRI-CARL; Camtasia												
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R												
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group												
<b>Payment Type</b>	Cash, prepaid (\$50.00); Other (Cash, prenotification letter)												
<b>Payment Method</b>	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office												
<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (BAM2)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing										
<b>Risk Level</b>	Some Concerns												
<b>Monthly Update</b>	Data collection is slated to end July 31, 2016. Final deliverables will go to the client the first week of August.  Production is very slow (1-2 lws/week) and we expect to end data collection with an 86% calculated response rate, short of the 89% RR goal.  A sizable batch of files was recently added to the transcription team, and they are working to complete the cases through August.												

**Special Issues**

Persistent under-run.

**Cost**

Jul 21, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 1,696,511.07**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 1,818,161.98**Total Budget:** 1,938,455.00**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 120,293.02**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**

Jul 21, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 100,778.91**Actual Dollars Used:** 84,079.33**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 16,669.58**Reason For Variance:**

June expenditures were off from projections due to decreased production, and some project staff moving the majority of hours to other projects.

**Measures**

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	Phase 2: 145	89 Calculated	16 (phase 2)
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	1263 (1106 + 157)	89%	12 (average)
<b>Current actual:</b>	Phase 2: 130	86%	11
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	1238 (1106 + 132)	86%	
<b>Variance:</b>	25	3%	

**Other Measures**

<b>Project Name</b>	CogUSA Tablet and Saliva Collection (CogUSA Saliva)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mail	Secondary: Telephone	Total of Modes: 2										
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 171,995.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 266,593.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 266,593.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Jack McArdle (USC) Brooke Helppie (UM/SRC)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	National Institute of Aging (NIA)												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM00001406	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>											
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Zoanne Blackburn <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Dean E Stevens <b>Production Manager:</b> Joseph Matthew Matuzak <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Kirsten Haakan Alcser <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Production Manager:</b>												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	<p>The purpose of this study is to follow up with approximately 700 respondents from the last data collection wave of CogUSA. SRO will mail an advance letter, a pre-assembled tablet and saliva packets, and a reminder card to all respondents. Additionally, SRO will make an average of 4 follow-up calls to all respondents to schedule a delivery time and UPS pickup time and 3 telephone attempts to non-responders to remind them to return the tablets and saliva kits. SRO will log in returned saliva kits for storage at a local laboratory and return tablets to the PI at the conclusion of the study. We have budgeted for approximately 455 respondents to return their saliva samples and provide responses on the tablets.</p> <p>This budget assumes an overall SRO involvement period of 5 months commencing in November 2015 with the data collection taking place during a 2-month period, beginning January 2016.</p>												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	11/2015 - 04/2016												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	01/2016 - 04/2016												
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 11/01/2015</td> <td><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td><b>Recruitment Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Staffing Completed:</b></td> <td><b>GIT Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>SS Train Start:</b></td> <td><b>SS Train End:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DC Start:</b> 01/25/2016</td> <td><b>DC End:</b> 07/30/2016</td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 11/01/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>	<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>	<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>	<b>DC Start:</b> 01/25/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 07/30/2016
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 11/01/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>												
<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>												
<b>DC Start:</b> 01/25/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 07/30/2016												
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Hueichun Peng, Shaowei Sun, Dave Dybicki, Minako Edgar, Emily Blasyck, David Bolt												
<b>Other Project Names:</b>													
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	Project specific system (CMS)												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Other (USC program on tablet computer)												
<b>Hardware</b>	Tablet												
<b>DE Software</b>	Other (CMS)												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	N/A												
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R												
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group												
<b>Payment Type</b>	Check, post (\$40); Cash, prepaid (\$2)												
<b>Payment Method</b>	Check through STRak RPay System; Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office												

---

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (CogUSA Saliva)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	We have finished sending out packages to respondents, and are now focusing on trying to get the rest of the outstanding materials returned, preparing to hand over data and materials, and doing documentation.
-----------------------	---

At this point we have 431 completed interviews, so we have easily surpassed our goal, with ten tablets outstanding. One of those is in transit and the saliva consent form has been received, so we expect there to be data forthcoming.

Of the remaining nine, three were shipped in July so we have reasonable expectations that we will get those returned. We are far less optimistic on the others, as they were delivered from late February through early April and numerous attempts to arrange returns have not been successful, and one has been reported as likely stolen. On the majority of these cases we have had no contact with the respondent for at least a couple of months. We intend to send an email to those respondents for whom we have that information to see if that will help resolve things.

We have a few more checks to process, in addition to any that might be generated by the outstanding shipments, and that process will then be finished as well.

Our clerk is mostly finished with his work, and is mostly just trying to contact the remaining outstanding respondents and writing up some notes on his experiences in doing this project. At some point we'll also need to figure out handing over tablets and getting the saliva samples into storage, but there's not a lot of urgency there, and it will probably make sense to wait a bit longer. We will also need to fix the files that have been manually copied off and will need to hand those over as well. There are currently 148 of those files, or slightly more than a third of the cases. As I noted previously, a script has already been created to modify the files, so we just need to decide when to run it.

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

<b>Cost</b> <b>Aug 31, 2016</b>	<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	215,658.07
	<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	232,151.68
	<b>Total Budget:</b>	266,593.00
	<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	34,441.32
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Costs for shipping and interviewer hours have ended up being very significantly lower than projected.

<b>Projections</b> <b>Aug 31, 2016</b>	<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	16,493.61
	<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	16,493.61
	<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	0.00
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

<b>Measures</b>		<b>Units Complete</b>	<b>RR</b>	<b>HPI</b>
<b>Current Goal:</b>		400		
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>		400		
<b>Current actual:</b>		431		
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>		435		
<b>Variance:</b>		35		

#### Other Measures

<b>Project Name</b>	Detroit Metropolitan Area Survey (DMACS)			
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mixed			
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current	
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 233,426.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 23,343.00	<b>Total Budget:</b>	256,769.00
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Jeff Morenoff (Population Studies) Elizabeth Gerber			

<b>Funding Agency</b>	Kresge Foundation		
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Barbara Lohr Ward	
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>	Dean E Stevens	
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Bridgitte Wyche McGee	
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Kirsten Haakan Alcser	
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Joseph Matthew Matuzak	
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	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:**

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

---

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (DMACS)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Initiation
----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	During July, 2016, SRO activities included the following:
-----------------------	---

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Continued discussion of Ford proposal
- Adjusted data collection plan, monthly projections and cost estimates.
- Wave 1 questionnaire changes recommended by programmer submitted to IRB and approved

Task 2: Sampling

- Sampling completed.
- Sample cleaning for mailing completed.

Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Received initial quote for Spanish translation. After reviewing, sought three additional quotations from different vendors.
- Wave 2 questionnaire deadline pushed back to August 1st

Task 4: CAI Programming

- Programmer reviewed instrument and began programming

Task 5: Systems Programming

- Email address set up for project

Tasks 6, 7: Interviewer Recruitment & Hiring, Training

- Opened recruitment to on-staffers

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	\$	17,345
Expected cost at complete	\$	278,585
Expected Variance:	\$	(21,817)

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**  
**Jul 15, 2016**

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 17,345.00  
**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 278,585.00  
**Total Budget:** 256,769.00  
**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -20,430.87  
**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**  
**Jul 15, 2016**

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

**Measures**

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

**Other Measures**



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

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (HCAP 2016)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	Some Concerns		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	A second batch of 552 pre-notification letters was mailed on July 8, 2016.  Respondent average interview length has decreased by almost 6 minutes which is significant in terms of cost savings		

and reducing respondent burden.

The Spanish documents were submitted to IRB on July 15th, 2016 and approval was received on July 26th, 2016. STrak edits for Spanish continue (consents and receipts) and programming and testing of the Spanish questionnaire is complete. We aim to have the Spanish documents and instruments released to the field in early August.

The third sample release is planned for the first week in August - it will consists of ~350-400 Rs.

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

#### Special Issues

##### Cost

Jun 30, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 1,091,899.15

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 4,539,510.61

**Total Budget:** 4,476,719.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -62,788.61

##### **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 30, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 71,302.00

**Actual Dollars Used:** 52,123.02

**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 19,178.98

##### **Reason For Variance:**

#### Measures

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

#### Other Measures

<b>Project Name</b>	Health and Retirement Study (HRS 2016)													
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Mixed    Total of Modes: 2													
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	24,690,534.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	8,888,593.00 <b>Total Budget:</b> 33,579,127.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	David Weir (SRC) Mary Beth Ofstedal (SRC) Ken Langa (SRC)													
<b>Funding Agency</b>	NIA													
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	HUM00061128	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	1/15/2015 - 1/14/201										
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Nicole G Kirgis												
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>	Richard Warren Krause												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Stephanie Sullivan												
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Mary P Maher												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Jennifer C Arrieta												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Piotr Dworak												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data													
<b>Description:</b>	<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>													
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	04/2015 - 06/2017													
<b>Data Col Period</b>	02/2016 - 04/2017													
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA													
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 04/01/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest Start:</b> 10/16/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest End:</b> 11/07/2015</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2015</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Staffing Completed:</b> 03/15/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>GIT Start:</b> 02/10/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train Start:</b> 02/12/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train End:</b> 04/24/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC Start:</b> 02/22/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC End:</b> 04/29/2017</td> </tr> </table>				<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 04/01/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b> 10/16/2015	<b>Pretest End:</b> 11/07/2015	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2015	<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 03/15/2016	<b>GIT Start:</b> 02/10/2016	<b>SS Train Start:</b> 02/12/2016	<b>SS Train End:</b> 04/24/2016	<b>DC Start:</b> 02/22/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 04/29/2017
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 04/01/2015	<b>Pretest Start:</b> 10/16/2015													
<b>Pretest End:</b> 11/07/2015	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2015													
<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 03/15/2016	<b>GIT Start:</b> 02/10/2016													
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 02/12/2016	<b>SS Train End:</b> 04/24/2016													
<b>DC Start:</b> 02/22/2016	<b>DC End:</b> 04/29/2017													
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	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)													
<b>Other Project Names:</b>														
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak; MSMS													
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Blaise 4.8													
<b>Hardware</b>	Laptop													
<b>DE Software</b>	NA													
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	DRI-CXM													
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R													
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group													
<b>Payment Type</b>	Check, prepaid (80.00)													
<b>Payment Method</b>	Check through STrak RPay System													

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (HRS 2016)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	<p>During the month of July, data collection for the new cohort component and panel component continued. Goals were revised based on actuals through week 20 of data collection anchoring screening to end February 2017 and interviewing to end April 2017. This model indicates extra hours are needed to meet target completed interviews. Additional recruitment and training will be necessary to add more interviewer hours in order to meet production targets. Field interviewer training is scheduled for end of August with new interviewers beginning production in</p>
-----------------------	--

September. In addition, a small training of three on-staff interviewers is scheduled for mid-September.

Technical Development: During the month of July, 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.

#### Special Issues

##### Cost

Jun 30, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 15,073,307.58  
**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 32,136,650.65  
**Total Budget:** 33,579,127.00  
**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 1,442,476.35  
**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:** 2,300,695.44  
**Actual Dollars Used:** 2,130,233.28  
**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 170,462.16  
**Reason For Variance:** Actual dollars for the month of June came in just under projections, much closer than in past months.

#### Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	24,162	88.5%	7.45
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	24,162	88.5	7.45
<b>Current actual:</b>	8,273	33%	6.2
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	24,162	88.5	7.45
<b>Variance:</b>			

#### 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**

**PreProduction Start:** 04/01/2016

**Pretest End:** 12/21/2016

**Staffing Completed:**

**SS Train Start:** 05/11/2017

**DC Start:** 05/26/2017

**Pretest Start:** 10/24/2016

**Recruitment Start:** 06/01/2016

**GIT Start:** 05/09/2017

**SS Train End:** 05/22/2017

**DC End:** 05/24/2018

**Other Project**

**Team Members:**

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

SurveyTrak; SMS

Blaise 4.8; SAQ

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

Blaise 4.8 BIA ; External vendor (TBD)

DRI-CARI

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

SRO Group

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

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

**Report Period**

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

**Project Phase**

Implementing

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

During July, 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.
- Revised and updated project schedule.
- Received UM IRB approval with contingencies. Provided IRB text and documents to JHU for Homewood IRB submission.
- Prepared text, documents and instructions for Certificate of Confidentiality application.
- Prepared June monthly report.

## Task 2: Sampling

- Continued work to refine selection models and algorithm for sample selection of the population sample.
- Revised preload configuration for the sample management systems.
- Prepared materials and held meeting to discuss population sample selection approach.

## Task 3: Questionnaire Development

- Adult HH and Child-Specific SAQs
  - o Revised and finalized SAQ format.
  - o Delivered final data entry specifications for programming
- Child
  - o Tested Woodcock-Johnson modules. Provided instructions for programming revisions. Began revising existing training modules.
  - o Tested Hearts & Flowers; updated testing log and provided feedback on revisions to programmer.
- Post Interview Observations
  - o Tested post-interview obs.
  - o Revised format of paper Neighborhood Observation form. Revised data entry programming specification to conform to reformatted paper instrument.
- Time Diary
  - o Tested laser tape measurement data entry program.
- Made minor updates to Time Diary format.
- Adult CAPI Questionnaire
  - o Made updates to adult CAPI questionnaire specifications based on input from research team. Delivered to programmer. Made further revisions to household confirmation section specifications based on input from research team. Delivered specifications to programmer.
- Screening Questionnaire
  - o Finalized screening questionnaire specifications and delivered to programmer.
- Procurement
  - o Continued procurement for Pilot supply items.
  - o Researched potential vendors for specialized printing services.
- Pilot Interviewer Recruitment, Hiring, Training
  - o Posted openings for pilot interviewers and team leaders. Reviewed applications on a flow basis.
  - o Reviewed/updated 2014 training plan; made modifications for work-scope changes.
  - o Delivered draft training plan to research team.
- Thin Slice Training
  - ☐ Prepared paperwork for Visa for Heather Prime (Toronto University).
  - ☐ Made travel and finalized training arrangements.
  - ☐ Prepared models and printed materials for training.

## Task 4: CAI Programming

- Programmed timing modifications for Hearts & Flowers, prepared for testing.

- Programmed updates to Adult and Child post-interview observations.
- Programmed updates to neighborhood observations and laser tape measurement data entry modules and prepared for testing.
- Began iterative rounds of programming/testing of Child instrument, including Woodcock/Johnson sections.
- Began rounds of iterative programming/testing of screener instrument.
- Began initial programming of Adult CAPI instrument.

#### Task 5: Systems Programming

- Held technical meetings to discuss reorganization of sample management architecture for suggested choreography of survey administration within a household.
- Began progressive elaboration of SurveyTrak specifications.
- Began updates of SurveyTrak programming.

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

#### 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 6/30/2016	\$	214,954
Project Total Expended during 6/2016	\$	59,851
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:

- Questionnaire development effort significantly exceeds our original estimates. While the impact to the budget is likely to be relatively marginal given the overall size and scope of the project, this does impose tension with respect to staying on track with the project timeline, which has already had to be shifted.
- We are collaborating with other active SRC projects to staff for the pilot data collection, but we are attempting to balance getting local on-staff interviewers who may not continue with us, with getting Team Leaders who may support us during main data collection and facilitate a more successful main study.

#### Work Scope Changes:

- Questionnaire Development – Budgets assumed that questionnaires would be final at project initiation except for the Household Listing and Household Confirmation protocol. Questionnaires required extensive editing. SRC to review all questionnaires for question wording issues (especially problems created by moving questions to SAQ), create and insert transitions, review and suggest changes to module and/or question ordering.
- Questionnaire Development – Additional (and unanticipated) programming is needed for Hearts and Flowers due to specifications change received from research team.
- Work with ICPSR to prepare scope and budget for production of public use datasets.

### Cost Jul 23, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	437,767.00
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	9,134,412.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	9,134,412.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	0.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

### Projections Jul 23, 2016

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	0.00
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	0.00
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	0.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	No projections recorded for June

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

Other Measures



**Project Name** HRS 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**

**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** July, 2016 (CAMS 2015)      **Project Phase** Closing

**Risk Level** On Track

**Monthly Update** During the month of July, a few completed questionnaires were returned by respondents. These were logged and sent to HRS staff for data entry.

**Special Issues**

**Cost**  
**Jun 30, 2016**

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 410,491.20  
**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 361,252.40  
**Total Budget:** 415,752.00  
**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -54,499.60  
**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**  
**Jun 30, 2016**

**Dollars Projected For Month:** -49,551.60  
**Actual Dollars Used:** 18.95  
**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** -49,570.55  
**Reason For Variance:** Uncashed check voids were projected to hit in month of June that have not yet been voided by the business office. Projection for this is being pushed forward.

**Measures**

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

**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"><li>• 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;</li><li>• 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.);</li><li>• 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.</li></ul> <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**

July, 2016 (HRS LHMS 2015)

**Project Phase**

Initiation

**Risk Level**

Not Rated

**Monthly Update**

No update on July activity.

**Special Issues****Cost**

Aug 31, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):**

0.00

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

0.00

**Total Budget:**

941,665.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):**

0.00

**Reason For Variance:****Projections**

Aug 31, 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**

<b>Project Name</b>	Humility, Forgiveness and Social Relations: Ethnic & Racial Comparison (Forgiveness2015)			
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Telephone			
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	445,806.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	66,870.00
			<b>Total Budget:</b>	512,676.00
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Toni Antonucci (Life Course Development Program - SRC) Kristine Ajrouch (Life Course Development Program - SRC) Kira Birditt & Noah Webster (Life Course Development Program - SRC)			
<b>Funding Agency</b>	Templeton Foundation			
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	HUM00099310	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	thru 3/3/2016
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Christine Evanchek <b>Production Manager:</b> Ruth B Philippou <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Jody Dougherty <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Production Manager:</b>			
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data			
<b>Description:</b>	<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"> <li>1) How do social networks influence the virtues of humility and forgiveness?</li> <li>2) Do social networks influence well-being via humility and forgiveness?</li> <li>3) Do links among social relations, humility/forgiveness and well-being vary by ethnicity/race?</li> <li>4) Do patterns of social relations, humility, and forgiveness predict acceptance and/or discrimination between ethnic groups?</li> </ol> <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>			
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	04/2015 - 12/2014			
<b>Data Col Period</b>	07/2015 - 11/2015			
<b>Security Plan</b>	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

**Other Project**  
**Names:**

25 interviewers, 4 TLs  
 Detroit Community Study

**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

July, 2016 (Forgiveness2015)

## Project Phase

Closing

## Risk Level

Not Rated

## Monthly Update

Interview production has ended as of end June (with the last 9 interviews). July activity has centered around project close-out. Parameters/rules for automated close-out of all remaining sample was developed in July. This is a fairly complex process due to each address having multiple associated lines. A meeting to think through this process with sampling specialist and other key team members has helped to streamline a series of steps that project programmer will implement at the start of August. Other close-out activity this month included final respondent payments and final reconciliation of the (sizable) ICF.

## Special Issues

## Cost

Jul 31, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 582,183.71

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 592,183.71

**Total Budget:** 512,676.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -70,324.00

**Reason For Variance:** Per prior explanation of arrangement with Director's office, this is an anticipated overrun.

## Projections

Jul 31, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 22,064.96

**Actual Dollars Used:** 22,064.96

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

**Reason For Variance:**

## Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	1000		5.0
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	1000	.10	6.0
<b>Current actual:</b>	1012	.10	5
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	1012	.10+	6.2
<b>Variance:</b>	+12		.2

**Other Measures**

305 MENA, 67% Female ;295 AFAmerican, 74%Female;273CaucAm, 58%Female  
Spouse Respondents=138

**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:*** 693,562.00    ***Indirect Budget:*** 382,855.00    ***Total Budget:*** 1,076,417.00

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

**Funding Agency**

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

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

**Proposal #:** no data

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

**SRO Project Period** 09/2014 - 06/2016

**Data Col Period** 01/2015 - 12/2015

**Security Plan** NA

**Milestone Dates**

***PreProduction Start:*** 10/01/2014

***Pretest End:***

***Staffing Completed:***

***SS Train Start:***

***DC Start:*** 03/02/2015

***Pretest Start:***

***Recruitment Start:*** 01/26/2015

***GIT Start:***

***SS Train End:***

***DC End:*** 05/31/2016

**Other Project Team Members:**

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



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

SMS; Project specific system (SRIS)

**Data Col Tool**

SAQ; Other (video recorded on tablet)

**Hardware**

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

**DE Software**

Blaise 4.8 BIA

**QC Recording Tool**

N/A

**Incentive**

NA

**Administration**

NA

**Payment Type**

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

**Payment Method**

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

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (MTTS)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	During June, 2016, SRO activities included the following:
-----------------------	---

Task 1: Management, Budget and Work Plan

- Participated in occasional project management meetings with the research team
- Revised monthly projections and staffing plan.
- Prepared monthly report.
- Worked on budget and cover memo for de-obligation of funds.

Task 2: Sampling

- Participated in conference calls with research team to finalize sample selections for the Fall 2016 data collection.
- Delivered sample file.

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 &amp; Hiring, Training

Task 8: Main Data Collection

Task 9: Post Collection Processing

- Completing verification of data entry.
- Began scanning paper surveys for delivery.
- Began preparing parental consent forms for scanning.
- Began work on data book and final project documentation

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 6/30/2016	\$	896,152
Expected cost at complete	\$	1,010,978
Expected Variance:	\$	65,439

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 Notes:

Budget

- As noted above, labor for Sampling staff to draw a sample of unselected teachers for a Fall 2016 data collection, and to prepare weights and estimates for that sample, has been included in the current cost estimate. The financial projections now extend to December 2017, and will require a no-cost time extension.
- No reduction in estimated costs for the video data storage and technical support is assumed.

District Recruitment

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

MQI Teacher Recruitment

Teacher recruitment ended on March 18, 2016.

Special Issues

Cost

Jul 15, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	896,152.00
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	1,010,978.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	1,076,417.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	65,438.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Response rates were much lower than actuals, leading to lower than anticipated shipping, printing, and respondent payments.

Projections

Jul 15, 2016

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	47,782.00
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	18,690.00
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	29,093.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Lower than anticipated R payments, freight, and printing & duplicating due to low response rates. Labor costs to package and ship equipment for Harvard was far lower than anticipated.

Measures

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

Other Measures

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

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

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

**Budget** **Direct Budget:** 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

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

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

**Risk Level** *Not Rated*

**Monthly Update** NR calling continues. So far 396 Rs have been found/reminded through non-response calling.

So far there are 847 Web completes - this is distributed between 0.94% of those who were exclusively paper and asked for an alternative, 7.31% of those sent a letter with URL, and 9.14% of those who were sent an email with a URL. (Keeping in mind that this is an experiment and follows strict rules similar to administration of the traditional SAQ administration in terms of contacting/following up with Rs.)

Preparation for production 2017 continues: Exploration of Mobile style sheet has started as well as a new repository structure as we consider using Illume NEXT. As well, we are exploring text options and QR codes.

#### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b>	<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	117,415.79
<b>Jun 30, 2016</b>	<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	365,550.53
	<b>Total Budget:</b>	377,934.00
	<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	12,383.47
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

<b>Projections</b>	<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	40,950.37
<b>Jun 30, 2016</b>	<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	25,629.81
	<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	15,320.56
	<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

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

#### Other Measures

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	<div>Project Lead: Meredith A House</div> <div>Budget Analyst: Christine Evanchek</div> <div>Production Manager: Barbara Aghababian-Homburg</div> <div>Senior Project Advisor: Stephanie A Chardoul</div> <div>Production Manager:</div> <div>Production Manager:</div>				
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	<div><div>PreProduction Start:</div><div>Pretest End:</div><div>Staffing Completed: 01/31/2016</div><div>SS Train Start: 04/25/2016</div><div>DC Start: 05/18/2016</div></div> <div><div>Pretest Start:</div><div>Recruitment Start:</div><div>GIT Start:</div><div>SS Train End: 05/12/2016</div><div>DC End: 11/18/2016</div></div>				
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 (Rpav spreadsheet); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office (Rpav spreadsh				

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (MTF Tablet Pilot)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	On Track		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	<p>July activities:</p> <p>On July 5th, the team held a "testing party" to test improvements to SHApp Encrypt, SHApp Preload, a newer release of SurveyCTO Collect. The testing went very well. Before the fall pilot data collections we will update the tablets with these improvements/releases.</p> <p>We completed spring 2016 data processing and delivered the survey and paradata on 7/22.</p> <p>On 7/22, we submitted an IRB amendment for the fall data collections to remove the follow-up survey and instead carry out the hashed linking between the main survey and the contact info survey for the 12th graders. We could face</p>		

IRB challenges in doing so, but the PIs agree we should tackle this sooner rather than later. And our piloting results in the fall will be much closer to what we would experience in "real" MTF sessions with this change.

Stephanie and Meredith met with Richard and Ginny on 7/22 to review plans for the fall schools and discuss additional piloting activities and areas for exploration.

#### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b>	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
<b>Jul 31, 2016</b>	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	531,339.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	
<b>Projections</b>	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
<b>Jul 31, 2016</b>	<i>Actual Dollars Used:</i>	0.00
	<i>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	

#### Measures

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

#### Other Measures

<b>Project Name</b>	National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG 2010-2020)													
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Face to Face      Total of Modes: 1													
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	29,713,370.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	10,439,833.00 <b>Total Budget:</b> 40,601,208.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Joyce Abma (NCHS) Mick Couper (ISR)													
<b>Funding Agency</b>	NCHS, CDC, NICHD													
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	0002716	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	7/17/13 - 7/17/14										
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Heidi Marie Guyer <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Nancy Oeffner <b>Production Manager:</b> Theresa Camelo <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Mary P Maher <b>Production Manager:</b> Maureen Joan O'Brien <b>Production Manager:</b> Daniel Tomlin													
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data													
<b>Description:</b>	<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>													
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	09/2010 - 07/2020													
<b>Data Col Period</b>	09/2011 - 06/2019													
<b>Security Plan</b>	Yes													
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 03/01/2011</td> <td><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td><b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Staffing Completed:</b> 08/17/2011</td> <td><b>GIT Start:</b> 09/13/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/15/2011</td> <td><b>SS Train End:</b> 09/19/2011</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>DC Start:</b> 09/20/2011</td> <td><b>DC End:</b> 07/01/2019</td> </tr> </table>				<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 03/01/2011	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2011	<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 08/17/2011	<b>GIT Start:</b> 09/13/2011	<b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/15/2011	<b>SS Train End:</b> 09/19/2011	<b>DC Start:</b> 09/20/2011	<b>DC End:</b> 07/01/2019
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 03/01/2011	<b>Pretest Start:</b>													
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/01/2011													
<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 08/17/2011	<b>GIT Start:</b> 09/13/2011													
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 09/15/2011	<b>SS Train End:</b> 09/19/2011													
<b>DC Start:</b> 09/20/2011	<b>DC End:</b> 07/01/2019													
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Chrissy Evanchek--Budget Analyst, Jennifer Kelley--Project Manager													
<b>Other Project Names:</b>														
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak													
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Blaise 4.8													
<b>Hardware</b>	Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil													
<b>DE Software</b>	Other (ODK)													
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	N/A													
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R; Yes, Other (babysitting fee)													
<b>Administration</b>	SRO Group													
<b>Payment Type</b>	Cash, prepaid (\$5; \$40); Cash, post (\$40; \$60)													
<b>Payment Method</b>	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office													

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (NSFG 2010-2020)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

<b>Monthly Update</b>	<p>Quarter 20 began on June 20th. 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. Savings in quarter 19 will allow for additional travel and overtime in quarter 20. This should improve the yield but may also keep the response rates low again. We will work to balance yield, response rates and subgroup non-response. Year 6 interviewer recruitment and training plans are also underway. A security meeting took place on June 29th with SRO, CDC and NCHS staff 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  
Jul 15, 2016**

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 24,974,865.85  
**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 43,886,825.98  
**Total Budget:** 40,601,208.00  
**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** -2,785,237.00  
**Reason For Variance:** The total contract budget has not been updated in CRS to reflect the total contract amount, which has increased to \$41,101,388. The variance shown here is the difference with the new contract amount. This contract amount does not take into account an additional \$1.1 million that will be allocated in year 6. 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  
Jul 15, 2016**

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 427,473.12  
**Actual Dollars Used:** 403,012.84  
**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** 24,460.28  
**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
<b>Current Goal:</b>	545		9.0
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	1300		10.0
<b>Current actual:</b>	552		9.9
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	1181		10.9
<b>Variance:</b>	185		1.9

**Other Measures**

The goals and actuals shown above are through week 5 of quarter 20.



<b>Project Name</b>	Neurodevelopmental Pathways in Adolescent Health Risk Behavior (AHRB)				
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Class SAQ	Secondary: Web	Total of Modes: 2		
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current		
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 815,655.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 452,688.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 1,268,343.00		
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Daniel Keating (U-M SRC)				
<b>Funding Agency</b>	Health and Human Services (HHS), Department of-National Institutes of Health				
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b> HUM00084650	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	3/4/2015 - 3/3/2016		
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b> Meredith A House <b>Budget Analyst:</b> Dean E Stevens <b>Production Manager:</b> Kathleen S Ladronka <b>Senior Project Advisor:</b> Stephanie A Chardoul <b>Production Manager:</b> <b>Production Manager:</b>				
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data				
<b>Description:</b>	<p>During early adolescence systems in the brain that are characterized by heightened reactivity to motivational stimuli and rewards mature rapidly, while systems that enable more effective cognitive control and judgment mature more slowly. This "developmental maturity mismatch" has been proposed as a key contributor to health risk behavior among adolescents, which is of critical importance because: (1) risk behaviors are the leading cause of morbidity and mortality in this age group, including diseases arising from unprotected sexual activity and casualties arising from reckless behavior (including driving fatalities and serious injuries); (2) it is the peak age for the onset of a wide range of risk behavior patterns with potential long-term consequences, including substance use and abuse, and delinquency. The "developmental maturity mismatch" hypothesis, however, has not been directly tested in relation to risk behavior at a level sufficient to inform this critical health area. The primary aim of the ANDH study is to understand the behavioral, cognitive, and neural bases of risk taking, through integrated analyses of age differences, developmental trajectories, and individual differences in psychosocial, neurocognitive and neural imaging assessments.</p> <p>The study will involve data collection from 10th and 12th grade students (~2000 students total) in 7-8 local high schools (approximately 150 students from each age group per school), with group administration in the schools using laptops in a baseline data collection to be completed over a 3-month period in the fall of 2014. Each respondent will attend 2 ~45 minute sessions: one survey and one neurocognitive tests. After the baseline data collection, SRO will modify the survey questionnaire to operate as a web-based survey, and will administer the web survey to all 2,000 respondents in years 2, 3, and 4 of the project (in the fall of 2015, 2016 and 2017). A small number of respondents (150-160) will be sub-selected to undergo neural imaging at U-M facilities in Ann Arbor (SRO will not be directly involved in this portion of the study).</p>				
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	04/2014 - 03/2018				
<b>Data Col Period</b>	03/2015 - 01/2016				
<b>Security Plan</b>	Yes				
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <b>PreProduction Start:</b>  <b>Pretest End:</b>  <b>Staffing Completed:</b>  <b>SS Train Start:</b>  <b>DC Start:</b> 09/01/2016 </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <b>Pretest Start:</b>  <b>Recruitment Start:</b>  <b>GIT Start:</b>  <b>SS Train End:</b>  <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2018 </td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b> <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b> 09/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2018
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> <b>Pretest End:</b> <b>Staffing Completed:</b> <b>SS Train Start:</b> <b>DC Start:</b> 09/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b> <b>Recruitment Start:</b> <b>GIT Start:</b> <b>SS Train End:</b> <b>DC End:</b> 05/31/2018				
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	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)				

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

---

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (AHRB)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
----------------------	-------------------	----------------------	--------------

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

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

Technical development of a portal for respondents to access their survey and neurocognitive tasks, and SRIS modifications for waves 2-3 began. SRIS will be modified to be student rather than school-centric.

The PI decided to offer a \$30 incentive for the wave 2 survey activities. Wave 3 will offer at least \$30, so we are using these amounts in our cost projections (one of the two other cost estimates with options for increasing the incentive amounts which were provided with the scope increase document).

Meredith attended the full board review for the Waves 2-3 IRB amendment on July 6th. Contingencies were posted and the response to these submitted on July 20th.

#### Special Issues

<b>Cost</b>	<i>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</i>	0.00
<b>Jul 31, 2016</b>	<i>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Total Budget:</i>	1,268,343.00
	<i>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</i>	0.00
	<i>Reason For Variance:</i>	The projections now include the re-work for two waves of follow-up data collections.

<b>Projections</b>	<i>Dollars Projected For Month:</i>	0.00
<b>Jul 31, 2016</b>	<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** 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><b>PreProduction Start:</b></i>	<i><b>Pretest Start:</b></i>
<i><b>Pretest End:</b></i>	<i><b>Recruitment Start:</b></i>
<i><b>Staffing Completed:</b></i>	<i><b>GIT Start:</b></i>
<i><b>SS Train Start:</b></i> 09/21/2015	<i><b>SS Train End:</b></i> 09/24/2015
<i><b>DC Start:</b></i> 09/28/2015	<i><b>DC End:</b></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** July, 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. PI would like higher RR rate however even with increased mailings (postcards, \$2 with letter) RR rate not increasing. This is due primarily to length of activation period and nature of the study (many youth in

disfunctional living situations). PI has proposed another add on study and Proposal group is working on a Ball-park.

### 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 Jul 31, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 595,789.15  
**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 1,342,050.17  
**Total Budget:** 1,423,227.00  
**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 2,801.83  
**Reason For Variance:** Need to accumulate funds for potential no cost extension to complete data collection

### Projections Jul 31, 2016

**Dollars Projected For Month:** 43,711.39  
**Actual Dollars Used:** 52,412.52  
**Variance (Projected minus Actual):** -8,701.13  
**Reason For Variance:** Higher interviewing costs due to higher sample activated. Have adjusted expectations for period between study 1 and 2 in order to adjust budget for these higher volume months

### Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>	2447	85%	3.0
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	4200	85%	3.0
<b>Current actual:</b>	2430	69%	1.2
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>			
<b>Variance:</b>			

### Other Measures

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

Project Name	PSID Web Explore Core (PSID All Stars)														
Project Mode	Primary: Web      Total of Modes: 1														
Project Type	Sponsored Projects			Project Status	Current										
Budget	Direct Budget:	194,766.00	Indirect Budget:	108,096.00	Total Budget: 302,862.00										
Principal Investigator/Client	Vicki Freedman (SRC-PSID) Kate McGonagle (SRC-PSID)														
Funding Agency															
IRB	HUM#:	HUM00101072	Period Of Approval:	Non-regulated											
Project Team	Project Lead:	Meredith A House													
	Budget Analyst:	Janelle P Cramer													
	Production Manager:														
	Senior Project Advisor:	Stephanie A Chardoul													
	Production Manager:														
	Production Manager:														
Proposal #:	no data														
Description:	Phase 2 of converting the PSID core instrument to web. Phase 2 will use Blaise 5 and MSMS.														
SRO Project Period	09/2014 - 08/2016														
Data Col Period	06/2016 - 08/2016														
Security Plan	NA														
Milestone Dates	<table><tr><td>PreProduction Start:</td><td>Pretest Start:</td></tr><tr><td>Pretest End:</td><td>Recruitment Start:</td></tr><tr><td>Staffing Completed:</td><td>GIT Start:</td></tr><tr><td>SS Train Start:</td><td>SS Train End:</td></tr><tr><td>DC Start: 07/05/2016</td><td>DC End: 08/12/2016</td></tr></table>					PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:	Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:	Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:	SS Train Start:	SS Train End:	DC Start: 07/05/2016	DC End: 08/12/2016
PreProduction Start:	Pretest Start:														
Pretest End:	Recruitment Start:														
Staffing Completed:	GIT Start:														
SS Train Start:	SS Train End:														
DC Start: 07/05/2016	DC End: 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)														

<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (PSID All Stars)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing
<b>Risk Level</b>	On Track		
<b>Monthly Update</b>	<p>July activities:</p> <p>We launched on July 5th when the invitation letter to the first 100 (replicate 1) were mailed. There were a couple of bumps getting started -</p> <p>-there was a misunderstanding about who to exclude from the All Stars replicate so some cases, who in Core 2015 has indicated a mode preference other than Internet, were included in rep 1. In particular, 13 cases who indicated a preference for telephone. The initial intervention on this problem were to separate out these cases on the daily report so they could be monitored and to plan not to send them reminders.</p> <p>-the other bump was that the acronym "PSID" was showing in the URL as the survey authenticated to Blaise. The</p>		

team quickly swarmed the issue and renamed the aspx page to "mainpage" which was agreeable to PSID.

Rep 1 Reminder 1 was sent on 7/15, reminder 2 on 7/25. The decision to not remind the telephone mode preference cases was reconsidered and all rep1 sample ran the standard course.

As of 7/23, there are 25 eligible completes (1001) and 23 screen-outs (8010, ineligible completes). So 48% have "done what we've asked them to do" This is before receiving the 2nd reminder.

Respondent troubleshooting and questions so far have been in the following areas –

- Questions about ineligibility and, in a few cases, asking to have their survey reset.
- R unable to log in – using search bar instead of address bar
- R unable to log in – cases where MSMS showed ConductWeb as authorized, but the portal was receiving the message that the R should be blocked/survey Done. Reauthorizing solves the problem; the team is looking into the root cause of this problem.

Replicate 2 plans -

At the moment, the PIs are mulling over the plans for replicate 2. There is a meeting set for Aug 2 to discuss, but if anything, replicate 2 will be smaller, not larger than replicate 1.

Tentative schedule for replicate 2:

August 2 PI meeting  
 August 3 Decision to go ahead with replicate 2. How many?  
 August 3-4 Replicate 2 sample selected  
 August 4 Rep 2 list provided for mailing  
 August 5&8 Mailing prep  
 August 9 Rep 2 invitations mailed

#### Special Issues

Carrying a significant overrun - since before All Stars phase (phase 2 of webinizing). Remaining projections are slim - at this point we have gotten through the heavy integration work/testing with Blaise 5, MSMS and the portal. Team members necessarily spent more time than was budgeted in order to accomplish the scope. We set up a contingency account for the additional hours needed to launch and complete the All Stars pilot project, which has been a big help. At this point, it will be a matter of keeping the data requests from the PIs and PSID staff contained.

#### Cost

Jul 31, 2016

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

#### Projections

Jul 31, 2016

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

#### Measures

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

#### Other Measures

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

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

**Risk Level** *Not Rated*

**Monthly Update**

June 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
- Final mailings, text messages, emails and reminder calls were made to respondents in the last two weeks of June

**Special Issues**

**Cost**

Jun 30, 2016

**Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):** 568,122.93

**Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):** 666,223.20

**Total Budget:** 706,428.00

**Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):** 40,204.80

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

**Other Measures**



<b>Project Name</b>	Social Networks and Well Being (SN&WB)													
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Face to Face      Secondary: Telephone													
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects		<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b>	516,716.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b>	284,195.00 <b>Total Budget:</b> 800,911.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Kira Birdett (University of Michigan) Karen Fingerman (University of Texas at Austin)													
<b>Funding Agency</b>														
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	2015-02-0123	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>	4/15/16-4/15/17										
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Heidi Marie Guyer												
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>													
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Kathleen S Ladronka												
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Kirsten Haakan Alcser												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Russell W Stark												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>	Esther H Ullman												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data													
<b>Description:</b>	<p>SRO will screen and invite 500 adults over 65 years of age residing in Austin, TX to complete an in-person interview and follow up assessments. The primary aims of this study are to examine the effects of members of one's social network versus others encountered in terms of the quality of the relationship as well as physical, emotional and cognitive functions associated with social interactions among adults older than 65 residing in the Austin Metropolitan Statistical Area.</p> <p>The screening interview will be conducted in the Survey Services Lab (SSL). The main interview will be conducted in person in the respondent's home by local field staff. The main interview will collect information on demographic characteristics, social networks, and emotional, cognitive and physical functioning including walking speed and grip strength. At the end of the main interview, the interviewer will instruct the respondent on using an Android device (smartphone) programmed with the Electronically Activated Recorder (EAR) and daily surveys (mobile-ecological momentary assessment: mEMA) as well as a microphone for the recordings and a wrist Actigraph. The interviewer will explain the instructions for each of the three monitoring systems: EAR, mEMA and the Actigraph. Participants will use the 3 devices during a 4-day (intensive) data collection period starting on a Thurs, Fri or Sat to encompass 2 weekend days and 2 weekdays. The interviewer will leave the devices and instructions with the respondent and schedule a time to return to pick them up after the 4-day period. The interviewer will also leave a self-administered paper questionnaire with the respondent. The respondent will be instructed to complete the questionnaire on their own and return it to the University of Texas. The interviewer will also be responsible for daily reminder/troubleshooting calls to the respondent.</p>													
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	01/2016 - 04/2017													
<b>Data Col Period</b>														
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA													
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>PreProduction Start:</b> 01/01/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/15/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Staffing Completed:</b> 07/25/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>GIT Start:</b> 08/27/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train Start:</b> 10/17/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train End:</b> 10/20/2016</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC Start:</b> 10/22/2016</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC End:</b></td> </tr> </table>				<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 01/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/15/2016	<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 07/25/2016	<b>GIT Start:</b> 08/27/2016	<b>SS Train Start:</b> 10/17/2016	<b>SS Train End:</b> 10/20/2016	<b>DC Start:</b> 10/22/2016	<b>DC End:</b>
<b>PreProduction Start:</b> 01/01/2016	<b>Pretest Start:</b>													
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b> 06/15/2016													
<b>Staffing Completed:</b> 07/25/2016	<b>GIT Start:</b> 08/27/2016													
<b>SS Train Start:</b> 10/17/2016	<b>SS Train End:</b> 10/20/2016													
<b>DC Start:</b> 10/22/2016	<b>DC End:</b>													
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Karl Dinkelmann, Marsha Skoman, Lisa Quist, Holly Ackerman, Dan Zahs, Paul Burton, Grace Tison, Suzanne Hodge													
<b>Other Project Names:</b>	Daily Experiences and Well-Being (DEWS)													
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	SurveyTrak													
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	Blaise 4.8; SAQ; Other (mEMA and EAR app on Android, Actical)													
<b>Hardware</b>	Laptop; Tablet; [UM cell] Phone; Paper and Pencil; Other (Android device, Actical device)													
<b>DE Software</b>	NA													
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	DRI-CARI; Live monitoring													
<b>Incentive</b>	Yes, R													
<b>Administration</b>	NA													
<b>Payment Type</b>	Cash, prepaid (\$1); Cash, post (\$50 + \$100)													
<b>Payment Method</b>	Interviewer payment of cash (reimbursed/reconciled via Tenrox); Imprest Cash Fund from ISR Business Office													

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

**Risk Level** *Some Concerns*

**Monthly Update** The activities in the month of June and July 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. As planned 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. Not all testing can be done until vendors provide more finalized versions (EAR, mEMA in particular). We are also considering data delivery options (directly to UT Box for ancillary data). Meetings were held with CMT to review security of additional devices and firm up protocols if devices (phone) lost or stolen.

**Special Issues** The Technical team has been charged with development of many new systems to integrate actual set up, mEMA and EAR in addition to a relatively complex Main Blaise application. Good progress has been made however vendors still need to provide more developed applications for us to be able to fully test

**Cost**  
**Aug 31, 2016**

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	71,069.86
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	788,761.18
<b>Total Budget:</b>	800,911.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	135.51
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Some risk that development tasks and HPI may increase costs beyond those projected

**Projections**  
**Aug 31, 2016**

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	59,679.09
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	27,565.08
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	32,114.01
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	Programming of various components is underway but we do not have final versions from vendors so can not fully integrate and test within ST and data delivery

Measures	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>			
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	300		8.8
<b>Current actual:</b>			
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>			
<b>Variance:</b>			

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

<b>Project Name</b>	Surveys of Consumer Attitudes (SCA 2016)												
<b>Project Mode</b>	Primary: Telephone      Total of Modes: 1												
<b>Project Type</b>	Sponsored Projects	<b>Project Status</b>	Current										
<b>Budget</b>	<b>Direct Budget:</b> 697,302.00	<b>Indirect Budget:</b> 0.00	<b>Total Budget:</b> 697,302.00										
<b>Principal Investigator/Client</b>	Dr. Richard T. Curtin (SRC)												
<b>Funding Agency</b>	Bloomberg, others for Riders.												
<b>IRB</b>	<b>HUM#:</b>	<b>Period Of Approval:</b>											
<b>Project Team</b>	<b>Project Lead:</b>	Joseph Matthew Matuzak											
	<b>Budget Analyst:</b>	Dean E Stevens											
	<b>Production Manager:</b>												
	<b>Senior Project Advisor:</b>	Mary P Maher											
	<b>Production Manager:</b>												
	<b>Production Manager:</b>												
<b>Proposal #:</b>	no data												
<b>Description:</b>	<p>The monthly Surveys of Consumers are a series of nationally representative surveys with households in the contiguous United States. The SCA is designed to measure changes in consumer attitudes and expectations.</p> <p>The objectives of the surveys are to learn what consumers think about economic events under varying circumstances and to determine why they think and behave as they do. Since changes in attitudes and expectations occur in advance of behavior, measures of consumer attitudes and expectations can act as leading indicators of aggregate economic activity. The survey measures are not intended to establish the absolute level of consumer sentiment at any given time. The SCA is intended to measure change. Each month the SSL interviewing staff obtains 500 interviews.</p>												
<b>SRO Project Period</b>	01/2016 - 12/2016												
<b>Data Col Period</b>	01/2016 - 12/2016												
<b>Security Plan</b>	NA												
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>PreProduction Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Pretest End:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Recruitment Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>Staffing Completed:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>GIT Start:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>SS Train End:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC Start:</b></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><b>DC End:</b></td> </tr> </table>			<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>	<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>	<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>	<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>	<b>DC Start:</b>	<b>DC End:</b>
<b>PreProduction Start:</b>	<b>Pretest Start:</b>												
<b>Pretest End:</b>	<b>Recruitment Start:</b>												
<b>Staffing Completed:</b>	<b>GIT Start:</b>												
<b>SS Train Start:</b>	<b>SS Train End:</b>												
<b>DC Start:</b>	<b>DC End:</b>												
<b>Other Project Team Members:</b>	Dave Dybicki Ann Munster Kelley Popielarz Pamela Swanson Jennie Williams LaVelvet Harrison												
<b>Other Project Names:</b>													
<b>Sample Mgmt Sys</b>	NA												
<b>Data Col Tool</b>	NA												
<b>Hardware</b>	NA												
<b>DE Software</b>	NA												
<b>QC Recording Tool</b>	NA												
<b>Incentive</b>	NA												
<b>Administration</b>	NA												
<b>Payment Type</b>	NA												
<b>Payment Method</b>	NA												
<b>Report Period</b>	July, 2016 (SCA 2016)	<b>Project Phase</b>	Implementing										
<b>Risk Level</b>	Some Concerns												
<b>Monthly Update</b>	SCA had an extra week of production time in July, so we managed to keep production hitting desired totals throughout the study month, but this came at a cost, as our HPI was high and we thus used a greater than anticipated number of												

interviewer hours. In consultation with study staff, we ended a day early just two interviews short of our expanded goal of 540 completed interviews, ending instead with 538, with a 359 RDDs and 179 Recons. This month's instrument was the longest we have had while calling cell phones, at 36.6 minutes in length. We had a very solid prelim, with 410 completes, and our HPI, while still high, improved compared with the previous month. We identified fifteen new interviewers for the project, split between new hires and on-staffers, while saying goodbye to one of our team leaders and a couple of experienced interviewers.

#### Special Issues

##### Cost

Aug 31, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	376,487.23	
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	737,489.25	
<b>Total Budget:</b>	697,302.00	
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	-40,187.25	
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	The addition of extra interviews each month since March, a significant scope change, combined with lessened efficiency in collecting those extras, has pushed us into deficit.	

##### Projections

Aug 31, 2016

<b>Dollars Projected For Month:</b>	60,678.00	
<b>Actual Dollars Used:</b>	0.24	
<b>Variance (Projected minus Actual):</b>	-1,148.76	
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	We again experienced an unexpectedly high HPI this month, and needed to add additional hours simply to hit our goal.	

#### Measures

	Units Complete	RR	HPI
<b>Current Goal:</b>			
<b>Goal at Completion:</b>	540	10	2.8
<b>Current actual:</b>			
<b>Estimate at Complete:</b>	538	18	3.55
<b>Variance:</b>	-2	8	0.75

#### 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**

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

**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)  
Campus Sustainability

**Other Project Names:**

**Sample Mgmt Sys** Illume

**Data Col Tool** Illume

**Hardware** NA

**DE Software** N/A

**QC Recording Tool** N/A

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

**Administration** SRO Group

**Payment Type** Other (Amazon gift code)

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

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

**Risk Level** On Track

**Monthly Update** July '16

-An SDG meeting was held to discuss the issues around skipping a year and what the design should be moving forward.

-Andrew H., Heather, and Andrew P. worked on their chapters for the book for next year's international sustainability

conference to be held at ISR in May. The first chapter drafts are due in September.

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

-Some of the under run has been allocated to Minako (40 hours per month July/Aug/Sept) to help with PI requests. We will use the same account and Andrew H. will monitor.

-Dan delivered the panel weights at the end of June. The team is working on the analysis of panel data now that they have the weights.

To Do:

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

June '16

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

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

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

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

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

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

To Do:

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

May '16

Work in May included:

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

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

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

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

To Do:

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

April '16

Work in April included:

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

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

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

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

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

To Do:

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

#### March '16

##### Work in March included:

- Andrew and Minako continue to meet with the PIs regularly.
- Andrew H., Will, Heather, and Andrew P. (PSM student) are working on methodological analysis from the 2014 and 2015 surveys (AAPOR and IFDTC abstracts were accepted).
- Andrew H. worked on the methods report basing it on the items to report from the AAPOR transparency initiative.
- Minako discovered an issue with a new question programmed in the 2015 survey. It was similar to a question in prior years. The similar question also remained in the survey. During programming the new question was programmed using the original variable names and the previous question was assigned new variable names by mistake. The variables were renamed in the 2015 dataset to be consistent with prior years.

##### To Do:

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

#### February '16

##### Work in February included:

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

##### To Do:

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

#### January '16

##### Work in January included:

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

##### To do:

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

5. Notify raffle winners.
6. Reconcile imprest cash account.

#### December '15

##### Work in December included:

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

##### To do:

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

#### November '15

##### Work in November included:

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

##### To do:

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

#### October '15

##### Work in October included:

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



To do:

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

September '15

Work in September included:

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

To do:

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

Aug. '15

Work in August included:

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

To do:

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

July '15

Work in July included:

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

To do:

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

## Special Issues

### Cost

Jul 31, 2016

<b>Total Cost to Date (Direct + Indirect):</b>	54,597.00
<b>Estimated Cost at Completion (E\$AC):</b>	54,597.00
<b>Total Budget:</b>	69,535.00
<b>Variance (Budget minus E\$AC):</b>	14,938.00
<b>Reason For Variance:</b>	

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**  
**Jul 31, 2016**

**Dollars Projected For Month:**

9,630.58

**Actual Dollars Used:**

6,240.79

**Variance (Projected minus Actual):**

3,389.79

**Reason For Variance:**

June '16 - End FY16 with an under run. Minako is still doing work for the PIs (40/mo projected for July-Sept). We are not conducting a survey. Data collection will resume in the Fall of 2017.

April '16 - Unused projections moved forward.

March '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.

February '16 - Unused projections were moved forward.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Measures**

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

**Other Measures**