The Big Lift Evaluation

Research Findings Five Years In—Technical Appendix

CELIA J. GOMEZ, JILL S. CANNON, MICHELLE BONGARD

Sponsored by the Silicon Valley Community Foundation

For more information on this publication, visit **www.rand.org/t/RRA1411-1**.

Published by the RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

About This Appendix

The Big Lift™ (Big Lift) is a preschool–third-grade collective impact initiative in San Mateo County, California. It is a partnership of the County of San Mateo, San Mateo County Office of Education, and the Silicon Valley Community Foundation. Launched in 2012, it aims to boost children's reading proficiency by third grade through four coordinated strategies, called "pillars": (1) High-Quality Preschool, (2) Summer Learning, (3) Attendance, and (4) Family Engagement. To date, the initiative involves seven school districts in San Mateo County that began implementing Big Lift services in the 2015–2016 or 2016–2017 school year.

The RAND Corporation is conducting a multiphase evaluation of the initiative, including an implementation study of the four pillars that underlie Big Lift—*The Big Lift Implementation Study: Final Report* (Faxon-Mills et al., 2018)—and a series of annual descriptive analyses focused on the outcomes of children who received Big Lift services. The first three reports—*Big Lift Participation and School Entry Indicators: Findings for the 2016–2017 Kindergarten Class* (Gomez et al., 2017), *The Big Lift Descriptive Analyses: Kindergarten Readiness and Elementary School Reading Outcomes for the 2016–2017 and 2017–2018 Kindergarten Classes* (Gomez et al., 2018), and *The Big Lift Descriptive Analyses: Progress Across Three Kindergarten Classes* (Gomez, Whitaker, and Cannon, 2020)—focused on the early education and summer learning experiences of the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 kindergarten classes. In the fourth report, *The Big Lift Evaluation: Research Findings Five Years In* (Gomez, Cannon, and Bongard, 2021), we provide culminating information on the experiences and third-grade outcomes of the 2016–2017 kindergarten class, the first set of children to reach third grade. In addition, we look across all kindergarten classes for which we have data and explore the relationship between participation in Big Lift services prior to kindergarten and children's kindergarten readiness. This Technical Appendix accompanies the fourth report in this series of outcome studies (Gomez, Cannon, and Bongard, 2021). It and the related reports should be of interest to Big Lift stakeholders, including San Mateo County policymakers, educators, parents, and community members. Practitioners, policymakers, advocates, and researchers in other parts of the United States might find the information on this initiative useful for work related to the planning, implementation, or evaluation of other initiatives extending from early childhood through third grade.

RAND Education and Labor

This study was undertaken by RAND Education and Labor, a division of the RAND Corporation that conducts research on early childhood through postsecondary education programs, workforce development, and programs and policies affecting workers,

entrepreneurship, and financial literacy and decisionmaking. This study was commissioned by Big Lift with generous funding from the County of San Mateo.

More information about RAND can be found at www.rand.org. Questions about this technical appendix should be directed to cgomez@rand.org, and questions about RAND Education and Labor should be directed to educationandlabor@rand.org.

Contents

About This Appendix iii
Tables vi
Technical Appendix 1
Control Variables 1
Outcomes 4
Samples and Analytic Approach 5
Abbreviations 27
References 28

Tables

Table TA.1. Kindergarten Class 2016 Variation in BLIS Services, by Preschool Experience.....8
Table TA.2. Demographic Characteristics at Kindergarten Entry of Children in the 2016 Kindergarten Class for Whom There Are Third-Grade District Data, by Preschool Experience 9
Table TA.3. Unadjusted and Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares Regression Models Predicting Children's Percentage Attendance by Their Preschool Experiences for the 2016 Kindergarten Class 11
Table TA.4. Unadjusted and Adjusted Logistic Regression Models Predicting Children's Reclassification by Their Preschool Experiences for the 2016 Kindergarten Class 14
Table TA.5. Demographic Characteristics of Children Who Received Different Combinations of Big Lift Services Among the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes 16
Table TA.6. Preliminary Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares and Logistic Models Predicting Children's Kindergarten Readiness by Their Preschool and BLIS Experiences for the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes 18
Table TA.7. Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares and Logistic Models Predicting Children's Kindergarten Readiness by Their Combined Preschool and BLIS Experiences for the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes 21
Table TA.8. Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares Model Predicting Children's Kindergarten Readiness by Their Preschool and BLIS Experiences for the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes with High BLIS Attendance 24

Technical Appendix

This appendix provides additional details on the underlying data, statistical models, and results presented in *The Big Lift Evaluation: Research Findings Five Years In* (Gomez, Cannon, and Bongard, 2021), the fourth report in a series in which we evaluate The Big Lift™ (hereafter referred to as *Big Lift*). We first describe how we created each control and outcome variable and its source (e.g., parent report), followed by an overview of the regression models we employed. We then provide a full set of results, including all models presented in the full report and supplemental analyses. Text from this appendix draws heavily from the appendixes that accompany the second and third reports in this series, *The Big Lift Descriptive Analyses: Kindergarten Readiness and Elementary School Reading Outcomes for the 2016–2017 and 2017–2018 Kindergarten Classes* (Gomez et al., 2018) and *The Big Lift Descriptive Analyses: Progress Across Three Kindergarten Classes* (Gomez, Whitaker, and Cannon, 2020).

Control Variables

We use control variables measured at kindergarten entry. For research question 1b, the sample includes children from the 2016 kindergarten (K) class; thus, all controls were measured in fall 2016. Descriptive statistics for this sample can be found in Table TA.2. For research question 2, the sample includes children from all four K classes represented in the report (the 2016 K class to the 2019 K class); thus, the controls were measured at the start of each class's kindergarten year (fall 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019). Descriptive statistics for this sample can be found in Table TA.5. We explain the nature of each variable in the following subsections.

One limitation of all of the variables collected from the kindergarten entry forms (see the main report for details on the form) is that parents' self-reports may not have accurately captured non–Big Lift preschool enrollment or family demographic information. Parents may have felt pressured to answer a certain way, or they may have forgotten or misremembered program participation information. However, we have no evidence to suggest that data from the forms are not valid. Another limitation is that these variables were measured at kindergarten entry and not preschool entry, and control variables, such as family income, may have changed over that period.

Child Variables

Birth date was reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form. For students who had missing birth dates on the kindergarten entry form, we used data from the school districts.

Child age was calculated from information on the child birth date, reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form, and the date of assessment (recorded by assessors on the Brigance forms).

Child gender was reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form. We created a binary variable coded such that a value of 1 indicates a female child.

Child race/ethnicity was reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form and recorded in district data. Parents were asked to report on whether their children were Hispanic and on their children's race. There were five race categories: Alaska Native/American Indian; Asian; Black/African American; Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander; and White/Caucasian. Parents could check all that applied. From this information, we created a single race/ethnicity variable specified as a vector of mutually exclusive binary indicators that mirror the U.S. Census Bureau's reporting on race/ethnicity. Children coded in our data set as Hispanic were marked as Hispanic on the kindergarten form and could be that and any other race on the form. For example, children marked as Hispanic and Black/African American or Hispanic and White/Caucasian on the kindergarten entry form were coded as Hispanic for this study. Children marked as non-Hispanic and Black on the kindergarten entry form were coded as Black/African American non-Hispanic. Children marked as non-Hispanic and either Asian or Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander on the kindergarten entry form were coded as Asian/Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic. Children marked as non-Hispanic and White on the kindergarten entry form were coded as White/Caucasian non-Hispanic. Children marked as non-Hispanic and Alaska Native/American Indian, or non-Hispanic and two or more race categories on the kindergarten entry form (i.e., multiracial) were coded as Other. For students who had missing race data on the kindergarten entry forms, we used the school district data. The race data from the school districts were recorded and coded identically to the parent-reported data.

Home language was gathered from the school district data. Twenty-eight unique languages were recorded. From these data, we created a binary variable where a value of 1 indicates that a child spoke a language other than English in the home.

Assessment language was reported by assessors on the Brigance assessment form. We created two binary indicators from this variable. The first indicator, "Assessed in Spanish," was coded such that a value of 1 indicates that the child was assessed with the Spanish version of the Brigance. The second indicator, "Not Assessed in Spanish or English," was coded such that a value of 1 indicates that a translator assessed the child in a language other than Spanish or English. Given that the Brigance has not been validated or officially translated for languages other than Spanish and English, the results for these children might vary from those of the rest of the sample.

Assessment date was reported by the assessor on the Brigance form.

Parent Variables

Mother age at child birth was created from the mother's date of birth and the child's date of birth (reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form). We created a binary variable where a value of 1 indicates that a mother was younger than 20 years old at the birth of her child.

Number of parents in the home was created from information reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form. Parents reported on the marital status of each parent (options were married, living with partner, separated, divorced, single—never married, and widowed) and whether each parent was living with the child. We created a binary variable, labeled "two-parent home," where a value of 1 indicates that the child lived with a parent who was either married or living with a partner.

Parent education was created from information reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form. When data were reported on both parents, we recorded the information on the parent with the highest level of education. There were six categories on the entry forms: less than high school diploma, high school diploma/GED (General Educational Development), associate's degree (associate of arts/associate of science), bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctorate/Ph.D./M.D. We created a vector of four binary indicators by maintaining the first three categories and combining the last three into a bachelor's degree (or higher) category.

Family income was created from information reported by parents on the kindergarten entry form. The categories reported in Tables TA.2 and TA.5 exactly mirror those reported on the kindergarten entry form.

Missing Data

To include all children with outcome data in our analyses, we employed a *missing data indicator* strategy and created such an indicator for all of the controls. That is, we created a binary indicator for each control variable in which a value of 1 indicates a missing value on the control variable and a value of 0 indicates that the control variable was observed. Note that only one indicator was created for each categorical variable that is represented by a vector of binary indicators (e.g., income). All of our control variables with missing data are binary (e.g., gender) or categorical (i.e., race/ethnicity). For all instances of missing data, we imputed a "0" for the control variable, creating a data set in which all observations had non-missing values of each variable. All of the missing-data indicators and the control variables with imputed 0s were included in the models. Essentially, the missing data indicators allow us to treat as useful information the fact that data are missing for some variables observed, which could explain the variation in the outcome. Given that we had only a limited number of controls available, we chose this missing-data technique over other options—specifically, multiple imputation—that rely on having many control variables and analytic assumptions that our data did not meet (Little and Rubin, 2002). The rates of missingness for the samples used to address each research question are presented in Tables TA.2 and TA.5.

Outcomes

Attendance

Third-grade student attendance was measured by dividing the number of days attended by the number of instructional days a student was enrolled in the full 2019–2020 school year. Conceptually, we can think of the attendance measure as the percentage of expected days attended; numerically, the measure ranges from 0 to 100. The district data included only the full school year enrollment and attendance counts and do not allow analysis of attendance for only the portion of the year prior to school closures and remote learning caused by the pandemic. To account for children who were enrolled for a substantial portion of the school year, including before the pandemic, we included children who attended a Big Lift district for at least 90 days (i.e., half of a school year).[1]

We note that we did not examine chronic absenteeism as an outcome because of concerns about data quality for this measure given the change to remote learning at the end of the year. *Chronic absenteeism* is defined as a student who is absent at least 10 percent of the instructional days that they were enrolled. According to this definition, the rates of chronic absenteeism for the Big Lift districts were very low in the available data for the 2019–2020 school year compared with the rates reported in prior school years (according to the California Department of Education data reported through Ed-Data [see Ed-Data, undated]). Because chronic absenteeism is determined by a threshold, this measure may be more susceptible to variations in attendance recording during the pandemic; for example, schools may have counted attendance more leniently because of remote-learning situations. This and other pandemic-related practices may have led to artificially low rates of chronic absenteeism, making the measure unreliable as an outcome.

English Learner Reclassification Status

We used a binary language classification outcome that indicates whether a student who was formerly an English learner had been reported in the third-grade data as *reclassified as fluent-English proficient* (RFEP)—i.e., the student exited the *limited English proficient* status—by spring 2020. Only the students who were ever reported as English learners have a value for this indicator in our analytic data set; the indicator is coded 1 for students who were reported as RFEP and 0 for students who were reported as English learners as of spring 2020. In the aggregate, we present a percentage of students reported as RFEP, calculated as the number of students who were reported as RFEP divided by the total number of students who were reported as RFEP or as English learners.

[1] This criterion excluded 24 students with total days attended less than 90.

Brigance Early Childhood Screen III

The Brigance consists of 13 items that measure three domains: (1) academic/cognitive development, (2) language development, and (3) physical development. Because of Big Lift's interest in overall school readiness, we focus our analysis on the total score, a weighted average of all three domains. The tool is normed against a national sample of young children, and the total score is scaled for research purposes. Big Lift districts administered the Brigance to all entering kindergartners in the first three to six weeks of school in fall 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 for the children included in the report. Teachers and other school staff assessed students from mid-August through the beginning of October of each year. Although teachers administered the assessment early in the year, some variation in when the assessment was completed exists among classrooms, schools, and districts.[2] The variation likely does not influence the results, but it is important to note because children could have been in different developmental stages when the assessment was administered. Additionally, because the Brigance is administered by classroom teachers, slight variation in assessment procedures could have occurred, potentially creating bias in the results. However, all kindergarten teachers or assessors receive standardized Brigance training by the national Brigance trainer, minimizing any potential bias. Any error introduced by variation in test administration is likely to be random because there was no evidence to suggest systematically different testing procedures among groups of children who received different services.

The Brigance total score ranged from 63 to 131, with a mean of 90.6 and a standard deviation of 15.8 for the 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 pooled kindergarten sample. To address research question 2, we used a *low-income sample*, defined as a sample of children from families with annual incomes of $100,000 or less (see Table TA.5 for demographic information on this sample). The Brigance total score among this sample had the same range as that of the full sample (63–131), with a mean of 87.1 and a standard deviation of 14.6. In the primary model specifications, the outcome was continuous. We also conducted additional analyses in which we used a binary version of the outcome variable, coded such that a value of 1 indicates that the child scored a 90 or above. A score of 90 or above on the Brigance is defined as *kindergarten-ready*. In the pooled K class sample, 51.1 percent of children scored a 90 or above; in the Big Lift–eligible sample that we examined for research question 2, 41.9 percent of children scored a 90 or above.

Samples and Analytic Approach

In this section, we describe our research samples and the analytic approach we took to address each research question.

[2] To address this issue, we controlled for assessment date in all group comparisons.

Research Question 1a: What Are the Participation Rates in Big Lift Services from Preschool Through Third Grade?

The sample for this analysis consists of children from the 2016 K class for whom we had data at kindergarten entry (n = 1,496). We disaggregate participation by children from families with low incomes (defined as children from families with annual incomes of $100,000 or less; n = 853) and children from families with very low incomes (defined as children from families with annual incomes of $50,000 or less; n = 685). In Table TA.1, we present the descriptive statistics for Big Lift Inspiring Summers (BLIS) experiences broken out by preschool experience for the Big Lift–eligible subgroup only.

Research Question 1b: How Do the Third-Grade Outcomes of Children Who Enrolled in Big Lift Preschool Compare with Those of Children Who Enrolled in Non–Big Lift Preschool or Did Not Attend Preschool?

The sample for this analysis consists of children from the 2016 K class for whom there are third-grade data in the San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE) database (n = 1,189). We also conducted supplementary analysis on the children from families with very low incomes (n = 532, or 46 percent of the full sample). To address research question 1b, we used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to model students' percentage attendance as a function of a vector of binary indicators describing the students' preschool experiences: Big Lift preschool, non–Big Lift preschool, no preschool, and preschool unknown. The unadjusted models include only the preschool enrollment variables. The adjusted models include the preschool enrollment variables and the control variables already listed as well as the districts in which children were enrolled at kindergarten entry.

We used a logistic regression to model the binary English learner reclassification outcome as a function of children's preschool experiences. The unadjusted models include only the preschool enrollment variables; the adjusted models include the preschool enrollment variables and the control variables already listed. The coefficients are converted to and presented as odds ratios. Odds are an alternative way of expressing the probability p and are defined as $\frac{p}{1-p}$.

Odds are a way of expressing an association between the probability that the binary outcome will occur and a predictor. *Odds ratio* refers to the odds that the outcome will occur versus the odds that it will not occur in reference to the predictor of interest. All odds ratios are bounded at 0. Odds ratios that are less than 1 indicate a negative relationship between the predictor and the probability that the outcome will occur; odds ratios that are greater than 1 indicate a positive relationship between the predictor and the probability that the outcome will occur.

The results of the OLS models for attendance and the logistic models for English learner reclassification are presented in Tables TA.3 and TA.4, respectively.

Research Question 2: Among Children in All Available Kindergarten Classes Who Were Eligible for All Big Lift Services Before Kindergarten, How Do Kindergarten Readiness Skills Compare Among Children Who Experienced Different Combinations of Big Lift Preschool and the BLIS Program Before Kindergarten?

The sample for this analysis consists of children from the 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 K classes who are from families with low incomes (defined as children from families with annual incomes of $100,000 or less; n = 5,180). To address research question 2, we used OLS and logistic regression to model the Brigance continuous and binary outcomes as a function of children's preschool and summer experiences.

First, we conducted preliminary analyses in which we modeled the main effects of children's possible preschool and BLIS experiences. We included a vector of binary indicators describing the students' preschool experiences (as specified for the models in research question 1) and a binary variable indicating whether children attended BLIS. We adjusted for the demographic controls already listed, for the districts in which children were enrolled at kindergarten entry, and for indicators of their K classes. The results of these models are presented in Table TA.6.

For the primary model, we included a vector of binary indicators describing children's combined preschool and BLIS experiences: Big Lift preschool plus BLIS, Big Lift preschool without BLIS, non–Big Lift preschool plus BLIS, non–Big Lift preschool without BLIS, no preschool plus BLIS, no preschool without BLIS, preschool unknown plus BLIS, and preschool unknown without BLIS. We adjusted for the demographic controls already listed for the districts in which children were enrolled at kindergarten entry and for indicators for their K classes. The results of these models are presented in Table TA.7.

We conducted a sensitivity analysis with a subsample that excluded children who did not have *high BLIS attendance* (defined as attending 75 percent of BLIS programming). We excluded 201 children with low BLIS attendance, leaving a subsample of 4,979 children overall. We used OLS regression to model the Brigance total score outcome as a function of children's combined preschool and summer experiences, all demographic controls, the districts in which children were enrolled at kindergarten entry, and an indicator for their K classes. The results of this model are presented in Table TA.8.

Table TA.1. Kindergarten Class 2016 Variation in BLIS Services, by Preschool Experience

Big Lift Service	Children Who Attended Big Lift Preschool	Children Who Attended Non–Big Lift Preschool	Children Who Attended No Preschool	Children with Preschool Unknown
No BLIS	36	58	69	100
Any BLIS	64	42	31	0
One BLIS touchpoint	23	16	16	0
Only rising kindergarten BLIS	11	6	8	0
Only first-grade BLIS	7	6	4	0
Only second-grade BLIS	5	4	3	0
Two BLIS touchpoints	23	18	8	0
Rising kindergarten and first-grade BLIS	12	5	4	0
Rising kindergarten and second-grade BLIS	2	1	1	0
First- and second-grade BLIS	8	11	3	0
Three BLIS touchpoints	18	9	8	0
Total sample size	**321**	**367**	**160**	**5**

SOURCE: SMCOE database.
NOTES: The total sample consists of 853 children from the 2016 K class who we observed at kindergarten entry and who are from families with low incomes (defined as families with annual incomes of $100,000 or less). All rows except “Total sample size” are percentages of the subsamples listed in the column headers.

Table TA.2. Demographic Characteristics at Kindergarten Entry of Children in the 2016 Kindergarten Class for Whom There Are Third-Grade District Data, by Preschool Experience

Demographic Characteristic	All Children	Big Lift Preschool	Non–Big Lift Preschool	No Preschool
Brigance (mean)	90.90	86.06	95.79	83.16
Child gender				
Female	44.32	47.40	45.94	50.87
Male	46.43	51.21	47.93	49.13
Missing	9.25	1.38	6.13	0.00
Race/ethnicity				
Hispanic	40.12	73.01	29.71	38.15
Black/African American	1.01	1.73	1.07	0.00
White/Caucasian	9.25	3.46	13.78	6.36
Asian	31.71	19.03	37.83	41.62
Other	4.54	1.04	6.58	4.62
Missing	13.37	1.73	11.03	9.25
Home language				
English	49.62	25.26	59.88	49.13
Not English	49.62	73.70	39.97	50.87
Missing	0.76	1.04	0.15	0.00
Mother age at child birth				
Younger than 20 (teen mom)	2.94	8.30	1.23	1.73
20 or older	83.85	88.24	87.44	94.22
Missing	13.20	3.46	11.33	4.05
Parents in the home				
Two-parent home	70.48	68.17	76.72	77.46
Single-parent home	16.90	26.64	13.63	20.23
Missing	12.62	5.19	9.65	2.31
Parent education				
Less than high school degree	10.09	22.49	5.82	8.67
High school diploma/GED	29.69	49.13	21.75	38.15
Associate’s degree	13.29	9.69	14.70	19.65
Bachelor’s degree (or higher)	35.41	17.30	48.70	30.06
Missing	11.52	1.38	9.04	3.47
Family income				
Less than $10,000	6.14	10.73	3.83	9.83
$10,001–$25,000	14.38	31.14	7.96	15.61
$25,001–$50,000	25.15	43.94	18.68	28.90

Demographic Characteristic	All Children	Big Lift Preschool	Non–Big Lift Preschool	No Preschool
$50,001–$100,000	11.69	5.88	14.70	13.87
$100,001–$150,000	11.10	0.35	17.30	9.25
More than $150,000	8.58	0.00	14.85	2.89
Missing	22.96	7.96	22.66	19.65
Sample size	1,189	289	653	173

SOURCE: SMCOE database; kindergarten entry forms.
NOTE: The total sample consists of 1,189 children from the 2016 K class who we observed at kindergarten entry and have attendance and/or RFEP data. The values in the table, except for the Brigance (mean) and sample size rows, are percentages. The “All Children” column includes 74 children whose preschool experience is unknown.

Table TA.3. Unadjusted and Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares Regression Models Predicting Children's Percentage Attendance by Their Preschool Experiences for the 2016 Kindergarten Class

	2016 K Class		Very-Low-Income Sample	
Predictor	**Unadjusted Model**	**Adjusted with Controls**	**Unadjusted Model**	**Adjusted with Controls**
Preschool experience [reference is Big Lift preschool]				
Non–Big Lift preschool	0.003~	0.001	0.003	0.000
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
No preschool	–0.005~	–0.008**	–0.010**	–0.013**
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)
Preschool unknown	–0.005	–0.007	–0.070**	–0.071***
	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Birth date		0.000		–0.000
		(0.000)		(0.000)
Child gender [reference is male]				
Female		0.002		0.002
		(0.002)		(0.003)
Missing		–0.002		0.008
		(0.006)		(0.012)
Home language [reference is English]				
Language other than English		0.010***		0.013***
		(0.002)		(0.003)
Missing		0.003		–0.008
		(0.009)		(0.017)
Race/ethnicity [reference is White/Caucasian non-Hispanic]				
Hispanic		–0.003		0.002
		(0.003)		(0.006)
Black/African American non-Hispanic		0.006		0.010
		(0.008)		(0.011)
Asian/Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic		0.005		0.014*
		(0.003)		(0.006)
Other race		0.001		0.009
		(0.005)		(0.010)
Missing		0.003		0.011
		(0.005)		(0.008)

Predictor	2016 K Class		Very-Low-Income Sample	
	Unadjusted Model	Adjusted with Controls	Unadjusted Model	Adjusted with Controls
Family income [reference is $10,000 or less]				
$10,001–$25,000		–0.004		–0.003
		(0.004)		(0.004)
$25,001–$50,000		0.003		0.003
		(0.004)		(0.004)
$50,001–$100,000		0.002		0.000
		(0.004)		na
$100,001–$150,000		0.005		0.000
		(0.004)		na
More than $150,000		0.009~		0.000
		(0.005)		na
Missing		0.005		0.000
		(0.004)		na
Mother age at child birth [reference is mother age ≥ 20]				
Younger than 20 (teen mom)		0.006		0.004
		(0.005)		(0.006)
Missing		–0.003		–0.003
		(0.004)		(0.006)
Parents in the home [reference is single-parent home]				
Two-parent home		0.003		0.003
		(0.002)		(0.003)
Missing		0.005		0.007
		(0.005)		(0.006)
Parent education [reference is less than high school diploma]				
High school diploma/GED		–0.006~		–0.006
		(0.003)		(0.004)
Associate's degree		–0.007*		–0.009~
		(0.004)		(0.005)
Bachelor's degree (or higher)		–0.001		0.001
		(0.003)		(0.005)
Missing		–0.002		–0.004
		(0.005)		(0.008)

Predictor	2016 K Class		Very-Low-Income Sample	
	Unadjusted Model	Adjusted with Controls	Unadjusted Model	Adjusted with Controls
District [reference is CUSD]				
JESD		0.005*		0.005
		(0.003)		(0.004)
LHPUSD		–0.006		–0.007
		(0.006)		(0.009)
SSFUSD		0.002		0.003
		(0.003)		(0.004)
Constant	0.972***	0.857***	0.973***	0.959***
	(0.002)	(0.138)	(0.002)	(0.220)
Observations	1,164	1,164	532	532

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of Big Lift data.
NOTES: CUSD = Cabrillo Unified School District; JESD = Jefferson Elementary School District; LHPUSD = La Honda–Pescadero Unified School District; SSFUSD = South San Francisco Unified School District. The very-low-income sample consists of children from families with annual incomes of $50,000 or less. na = Variable was excluded because of change in missingness from dropped observations, or it was not needed in the analysis because of the subsample used. ~ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. The coefficients are raw, unstandardized point estimates with standard errors in parentheses.

Table TA.4. Unadjusted and Adjusted Logistic Regression Models Predicting Children's Reclassification by Their Preschool Experiences for the 2016 Kindergarten Class

	2016 K Class		Very-Low-Income Sample	
Predictor	**Unadjusted Model**	**Adjusted with Controls**	**Unadjusted Model**	**Adjusted with Controls**
Preschool experience [reference is Big Lift preschool]				
Non–Big Lift preschool	1.25	0.75	0.90	0.81
	(0.25)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.30)
No preschool	0.43*	0.40*	0.26**	0.30*
	(0.14)	(0.16)	(0.12)	(0.16)
Preschool unknown	0.38~	0.18*	1.00	1.00
	(0.21)	(0.13)	na	na
Birth date		1.00*		1.00~
		(0.00)		(0.00)
Child gender [reference is male]				
Female		1.16		0.78
		(0.25)		(0.22)
Missing		0.68		1.00
		(0.48)		na
Home language [reference is English]				
Language other than English		0.65		0.30
		(0.37)		(0.27)
Missing		0.84		0.50
		(1.03)		(0.92)
Race/ethnicity [reference is White/Caucasian non-Hispanic]				
Hispanic		0.75		1.25
		(0.54)		(1.49)
Asian/Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic		1.28		2.45
		(0.90)		(2.94)
Other race		1.64		0.55
		(1.59)		(0.97)
Missing		0.64		0.78
		(0.52)		(1.05)
Family income [reference is $10,000 or less]				
$10,001–$25,000		0.85		0.89
		(0.36)		(0.40)
$25,001–$50,000		1.16		1.22
		(0.47)		(0.53)
$50,001–$100,000		1.36		1.00
		(0.70)		na
$100,001–$150,000		5.63**		1.00

Predictor	2016 K Class		Very-Low-Income Sample	
	Unadjusted Model	Adjusted with Controls	Unadjusted Model	Adjusted with Controls
		(3.24)		na
More than $150,000		1.92		1.00
		(0.88)		na
Missing		0.85		0.89
		(0.36)		(0.40)
Mother age at child birth [reference is mother age ≥ 20]				
Younger than 20 (teen mom)		0.07*		0.06*
		(0.07)		(0.07)
Missing		1.50		1.26
		(0.68)		(0.73)
Parents in the home [reference is single-parent home]				
Two-parent home		1.06		0.89
		(0.31)		(0.30)
Missing		0.99		1.03
		(0.52)		(0.67)
Parent education [reference is less than high school diploma]				
High school diploma/GED		1.86*		1.41
		(0.58)		(0.51)
Associate's degree		2.59*		3.29*
		(1.12)		(1.82)
Bachelor's degree (or higher)		0.81		0.91
		(0.33)		(0.46)
Missing		1.93		1.77
		(1.17)		(1.40)
District [reference is CUSD and LHPUSD]				
JESD		0.24***		0.15***
		(0.09)		(0.07)
SSFUSD		1.31		1.38
		(0.40)		(0.52)
Observations	584	584	375	369[a]

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of Big Lift data.
NOTES: The very-low-income sample consists of children from families with annual incomes of $50,000 or less.
na = Variable was excluded because of change in missingness from dropped observations, or it was not needed in the analysis because of the subsample used. ~ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. The coefficients are presented as odds ratios with standard errors in parentheses. Because of small sample sizes, we combined two district indicators (CUSD and LHPUSD) and two race indicators (Black/African American and Other).
[a] Six observations were dropped because of collinearity between the outcome and covariates.

Table TA.5. Demographic Characteristics of Children Who Received Different Combinations of Big Lift Services Among the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes

		Big Lift Preschool		Non–Big Lift Preschool		No Preschool	
	All Children	Rising K BLIS	No Rising K BLIS	Rising K BLIS	No Rising K BLIS	Rising K BLIS	No Rising K BLIS
Brigance (mean)	87.14	86.98	84.84	92.24	91.91	81.74	81.47
Child age (years)	5.56	5.52	5.53	5.66	5.63	5.48	5.50
Child gender							
Female	49.19	42.99	50.31	53.08	48.90	49.50	50.54
Male	50.64	56.69	49.57	45.77	51.10	50.50	49.22
Missing	0.17	0.31	0.12	1.15	0.00	0.00	0.24
Race/ethnicity[a]							
Hispanic	61.49	74.02	78.07	58.85	45.52	64.36	52.46
Black/African American	1.24	0.47	0.99	0.77	2.26	0.99	0.48
White/Caucasian	7.53	4.72	4.78	6.92	11.45	1.98	7.44
Asian	23.94	15.43	13.54	25.38	32.88	25.74	32.17
Other	3.94	4.25	1.37	5.38	5.70	3.96	4.80
Missing	1.87	1.10	1.24	2.69	2.20	2.97	2.64
Home language							
English	37.51	25.20	24.53	39.23	51.28	33.66	44.66
Not English	62.41	74.80	75.28	60.77	48.72	66.34	55.34
Missing	0.08	0.00	0.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mother age at child birth							
Younger than 20 (teen mom)	6.29	5.04	7.27	2.31	5.70	5.94	7.44
20 or older	87.97	91.50	87.52	93.85	87.42	91.09	85.47
Missing	5.73	3.46	5.22	3.85	6.88	2.97	7.08

	All Children	Big Lift Preschool		Non–Big Lift Preschool		No Preschool	
		Rising K BLIS	No Rising K BLIS	Rising K BLIS	No Rising K BLIS	Rising K BLIS	No Rising K BLIS
Parents in the home							
Two-parent home	69.52	75.75	66.27	71.92	69.38	74.26	70.11
Single-parent home	24.94	19.21	26.58	24.62	26.29	23.76	23.53
Missing	5.54	5.04	7.14	3.46	4.33	1.98	6.36
Parent education							
Less than high school degree	14.67	18.90	20.31	14.62	7.66	16.83	13.93
High school diploma/GED	47.70	50.71	55.78	37.69	39.58	40.59	51.14
Associate's degree	14.83	14.33	11.12	16.92	17.92	19.80	14.77
Bachelor's degree (or higher)	20.37	15.12	10.68	28.85	32.28	18.81	16.69
Missing	2.43	0.94	2.11	1.92	2.55	3.96	3.48
Family income							
Less than $10,000	13.19	10.24	16.02	11.54	10.09	18.81	15.97
$10,001–$25,000	24.11	31.34	30.37	18.46	16.85	28.71	22.09
$25,001–$50,000	35.10	41.10	38.51	38.08	29.97	33.66	33.97
$50,001–$100,000	27.61	17.32	15.09	31.92	43.09	18.81	27.97
Sample size	5,180	635	1,610	260	1,685	101	833

SOURCES: SMCOE database; kindergarten entry forms.
NOTES: The variables were measured at the start of kindergarten (approximately fall 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 for each K class). The values in the table, except for the Brigance (mean) and sample size rows, are percentages.
[a] The race/ethnicity variables are mutually exclusive categories.

Table TA.6. Preliminary Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares and Logistic Models Predicting Children's Kindergarten Readiness by Their Preschool and BLIS Experiences for the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score	Logistic Regression: Brigance Score 90+
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**	**Adjusted Model**
Preschool experience [reference is Big Lift preschool]		
Non–Big Lift preschool	2.99***	1.41***
	(0.44)	(0.11)
No preschool	–5.84***	0.44***
	(0.52)	(0.04)
Preschool unknown	–3.34~	0.54~
	(1.73)	(0.18)
BLIS experience [reference is not attending BLIS]		
BLIS	1.93***	1.36***
	(0.47)	(0.11)
Child age (months)	–0.20***	0.97**
	(0.05)	(0.01)
Child gender [reference is male]		
Female	2.12***	1.30***
	(0.35)	(0.08)
Missing	0.14	0.57
	(4.25)	(0.49)
Home language [reference is English]		
Language other than English	–2.97***	0.69***
	(0.43)	(0.05)
Missing	–2.21	1.16
	(6.38)	(1.21)
Assessed in Spanish	–4.05***	0.48***
	(0.61)	(0.06)
Not assessed in English or Spanish	–3.34	0.66
	(2.56)	(0.30)
Race/ethnicity [reference is White/Caucasian non-Hispanic]		
Hispanic	–0.49	0.92
	(0.73)	(0.12)
Black/African American non-Hispanic	2.26	1.29
	(1.74)	(0.37)
Asian/Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic	4.42***	1.90***
	(0.76)	(0.25)
Other race	5.97***	2.31***

Predictor	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score Adjusted Model	Logistic Regression: Brigance Score 90+ Adjusted Model
	(1.12)	(0.46)
Missing	0.24	0.81
	(1.46)	(0.21)
Family income [reference is $10,000 or less]		
$10,001–$25,000	1.80**	1.40**
	(0.61)	(0.16)
$25,001–$50,000	3.66***	1.78***
	(0.60)	(0.20)
$50,001–$100,000	6.05***	2.43***
	(0.68)	(0.30)
$100,001–$150,000	0.00	1.00
	na	na
More than $150,000	0.00	1.00
	na	na
Missing	0.00	1.00
	na	na
Mother age at child birth [reference is mother age ≥ 20]		
Younger than 20 (teen mom)	–2.12**	0.69**
	(0.74)	(0.10)
Missing	–0.48	0.84
	(0.77)	(0.12)
Parents in the home [reference is single-parent home]		
Two-parent home	–1.40**	0.83*
	(0.44)	(0.06)
Missing	–0.92	0.92
	(0.85)	(0.14)
Parent education [reference is less than high school diploma]		
High school diploma/GED	0.95~	1.11
	(0.55)	(0.12)
Associate's degree	2.03**	1.31*
	(0.71)	(0.17)
Bachelor's degree (or higher)	4.57***	1.87***
	(0.71)	(0.24)
Missing	–0.74	1.22
	(1.24)	(0.28)
District [reference is CUSD]		
JESD	4.07***	1.67***
	(0.80)	(0.24)
LHPUSD	8.07***	2.46**

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score	Logistic Regression: Brigance Score 90+
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**	**Adjusted Model**
	(1.82)	(0.75)
SSFUSD	1.20	1.09
	(0.80)	(0.16)
RedCity	2.96***	1.49**
	(0.80)	(0.22)
RavCity	–2.12*	0.72
	(1.00)	(0.14)
SBPSD	3.81***	1.70**
	(1.00)	(0.30)
Screen date	0.01	1.00
	(0.03)	(0.00)
K class 2019	–15.47	20.57
	(28.84)	(105.25)
K class 2018	–10.23	7.61
	(19.21)	(25.93)
K class 2017	–4.44	3.17
	(9.74)	(5.47)
Constant	–217.29	na
	(543.44)	na
Observations	5,180	5,180

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of Big Lift data.
NOTES: RavCity = Ravenswood City School District; RedCSD = Redwood City School District; SBPSD = San Bruno Park School District. na = Variable was excluded because of change in missingness from dropped observations, or it was not needed in the analysis because of the subsample used. ~ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. For the OLS regression, the coefficients are raw, unstandardized point estimates with standard errors in parentheses. For the logistic regression, the coefficients are presented as odds ratios with standard errors in parentheses.

Table TA.7. Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares and Logistic Models Predicting Children's Kindergarten Readiness by Their Combined Preschool and BLIS Experiences for the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score	Logistic Regression: Brigance Score 90+
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**	**Adjusted Model**
Preschool and BLIS experience [reference is Big Lift preschool with BLIS]		
Big Lift preschool without BLIS	–1.60**	0.78*
	(0.62)	(0.08)
Non–Big Lift preschool with BLIS	3.34***	1.65**
	(0.95)	(0.27)
Non–Big Lift preschool without BLIS	1.29*	1.06
	(0.63)	(0.12)
No preschool with BLIS	–5.60***	0.39***
	(1.37)	(0.10)
No preschool without BLIS	–7.53***	0.34***
	(0.70)	(0.04)
Preschool unknown with BLIS	4.61	1.07
	(3.32)	(0.65)
Preschool unknown without BLIS	–7.88***	0.32**
	(2.06)	(0.13)
Child age (months)	–0.20***	0.97**
	(0.05)	(0.01)
Child gender [reference is male]		
Female	2.13***	1.30***
	(0.35)	(0.08)
Missing	0.11	0.54
	(4.26)	(0.47)
Home language [reference is English]		
Language other than English	–2.97***	0.69***
	(0.43)	(0.05)
Missing	–1.58	1.22
	(6.38)	(1.26)
Assessed in Spanish	–4.01***	0.48***
	(0.61)	(0.06)
Not assessed in English or Spanish	–3.22	0.67
	(2.56)	(0.31)
Race/ethnicity [reference is White/Caucasian non-Hispanic]		
Hispanic	–0.47	0.92
	(0.73)	(0.12)
Black/African American non-Hispanic	2.30	1.30
	(1.74)	(0.38)

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score	Logistic Regression: Brigance Score 90+
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**	**Adjusted Model**
Asian/Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic	4.45***	1.90***
	(0.76)	(0.25)
Other race	6.01***	2.32***
	(1.12)	(0.46)
Missing	0.28	0.81
	(1.46)	(0.21)
Family income [reference is $10,000 or less]		
$10,001–$25,000	1.83**	1.41**
	(0.61)	(0.17)
$25,001–$50,000	3.66***	1.78***
	(0.60)	(0.20)
$50,001–$100,000	6.08***	2.44***
	(0.68)	(0.30)
$100,001–$150,000	0.00	1.00
	na	na
More than $150,000	0.00	1.00
	na	na
Missing	0.00	1.00
	na	na
Mother age at child birth [reference is mother age ≥ 20]		
Younger than 20 (teen mom)	–2.15**	0.69**
	(0.74)	(0.10)
Missing	–0.49	0.84
	(0.77)	(0.12)
Parents in the home [reference is single-parent home]		
Two-parent home	–1.41**	0.83*
	(0.44)	(0.06)
Missing	–0.94	0.92
	(0.85)	(0.14)
Parent education [reference is less than high school diploma]		
High school diploma/GED	0.93~	1.11
	(0.55)	(0.12)
Associate's degree	2.02**	1.31*
	(0.71)	(0.17)
Bachelor's degree (or higher)	4.55***	1.87***
	(0.71)	(0.24)
Missing	–0.72	1.22
	(1.24)	(0.28)

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score	Logistic Regression: Brigance Score 90+
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**	**Adjusted Model**
District [reference is CUSD]		
JESD	4.07***	1.66***
	(0.80)	(0.24)
LHPUSD	8.20***	2.49**
	(1.82)	(0.77)
SSFUSD	1.22	1.09
	(0.80)	(0.16)
RedCSD	2.89***	1.48**
	(0.80)	(0.22)
RavCity	–2.25*	0.71~
	(1.01)	(0.14)
SBPSD	3.76***	1.68**
	(1.00)	(0.30)
Screen date	0.02	1.00
	(0.03)	(0.00)
K class 2019	–16.72	18.32
	(28.83)	(93.79)
K class 2018	–11.08	7.04
	(19.21)	(23.99)
K class 2017	–4.90	3.04
	(9.74)	(5.26)
Constant	–239.62	na
	(543.39)	na
Observations	5,180	5,180

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of Big Lift data.
NOTES: na = Variable was excluded because of change in missingness from dropped observations, or it was not needed in the analysis because of the subsample used. ~ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. For the OLS regression, the coefficients are raw, unstandardized point estimates with standard errors in parentheses. For the logistic regression, the coefficients are presented as odds ratios with standard errors in parentheses.

Table TA.8. Adjusted Ordinary Least Squares Model Predicting Children's Kindergarten Readiness by Their Preschool and BLIS Experiences for the Pooled 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Kindergarten Classes with High BLIS Attendance

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**
Preschool and BLIS experience [reference is Big Lift preschool with BLIS]	
Big Lift preschool without BLIS	–2.50***
	(0.67)
Non–Big Lift preschool with BLIS	3.20**
	(1.06)
Non–Big Lift preschool without BLIS	0.44
	(0.68)
No preschool with BLIS	–5.86***
	(1.47)
No preschool without BLIS	–8.40***
	(0.74)
Preschool unknown with BLIS	–1.23
	(5.21)
Preschool unknown without BLIS	–8.72***
	(2.08)
Child age (months)	–0.21***
	(0.05)
Child gender [reference is male]	
Female	2.04***
	(0.36)
Missing	–0.33
	(4.26)
Home language [reference is English]	
Language other than English	–2.91***
	(0.43)
Missing	–1.37
	(6.39)
Assessed in Spanish	–4.21***
	(0.63)
Not assessed in English or Spanish	–4.11
	(2.67)
Race/ethnicity [reference is White/Caucasian non-Hispanic]	
Hispanic	–0.44
	(0.74)
Black/African American non-Hispanic	2.28
	(1.77)

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**
Asian/Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander non-Hispanic	4.55***
	(0.77)
Other race	6.32***
	(1.13)
Missing	0.76
	(1.49)
Family income [reference is $10,000 or less]	
$10,001–$25,000	1.79**
	(0.63)
$25,001–$50,000	3.53***
	(0.61)
$50,001–$100,000	5.98***
	(0.69)
$100,001–$150,000	0.00
	na
More than $150,000	0.00
	na
Missing	0.00
	na
Mother age at child birth [reference is mother age ≥ 20]	
Younger than 20 (teen mom)	–2.02**
	(0.76)
Missing	–0.66
	(0.78)
Parents in the home [reference is single-parent home]	
Two-parent home	–1.29**
	(0.45)
Missing	–0.96
	(0.86)
Parent education [reference is less than high school diploma]	
High school diploma/GED	0.83
	(0.57)
Associate's degree	1.92**
	(0.73)
Bachelor's degree (or higher)	4.43***
	(0.73)
Missing	–0.66
	(1.27)

	OLS: Continuous Brigance Score
Predictor	**Adjusted Model**
District [reference is CUSD]	
JESD	4.03***
	(0.81)
LHPUSD	8.23***
	(1.96)
SSFUSD	1.29
	(0.82)
RedCSD	3.06***
	(0.82)
RavCity	–2.46*
	(1.03)
SBPSD	3.88***
	(1.03)
Screen date	0.02
	(0.03)
K class 2019	–23.31
	(29.53)
K class 2018	–15.47
	(19.67)
K class 2017	–6.88
	(9.97)
Constant	–363.96
	(556.55)
Observations	4,979

SOURCE: Authors' analysis of Big Lift data.
NOTES: na = Variable was excluded because of change in missingness from dropped observations, or it was not needed in the analysis because of the subsample used. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. The coefficients are raw, unstandardized point estimates with standard errors in parentheses.

Abbreviations

BLIS	Big Lift Inspiring Summers
CUSD	Cabrillo Unified School District
GED	General Educational Development
JESD	Jefferson Elementary School District
K	kindergarten
LHPUSD	La Honda–Pescadero Unified School District
OLS	ordinary least squares
RavCity	Ravenswood City School District
RedCSD	Redwood City School District
RFEP	reclassified as fluent-English proficient
SBPSD	San Bruno Park School District
SMCOE	San Mateo County Office of Education
SSFUSD	South San Francisco Unified School District

References

Ed-Data, homepage, undated. As of August 26, 2021: https://www.ed-data.org

Faxon-Mills, Susannah, Anamarie Whitaker, Jill S. Cannon, Celia J. Gomez, and Lynn A. Karoly, *The Big Lift Implementation Study: Final Report*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-2138-SVCF, 2018. As of June 16, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2138.html

Gomez, Celia J., Jill S. Cannon, and Michelle Bongard, *The Big Lift Evaluation: Research Findings Five Years In*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-A1411-1, 2021. As of November 9, 2021: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA1411-1.html

Gomez, Celia J., Jill S. Cannon, Anamarie A. Whitaker, and Lynn A. Karoly, *Big Lift Participation and School Entry Indicators: Findings for the 2016–2017 Kindergarten Class*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, 2017. As of September 2, 2021: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2131.html

Gomez, Celia J., Anamarie A. Whitaker, and Jill S. Cannon, *The Big Lift Descriptive Analyses: Progress Across Three Kindergarten Classes*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-3262-SVCF, 2020. As of As of June 16, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3262.html

Gomez, Celia J., Anamarie A. Whitaker, Jill S. Cannon, and Lynn A. Karoly, *The Big Lift Descriptive Analyses: Kindergarten Readiness and Elementary School Reading Outcomes for the 2016–2017 and 2017–2018 Kindergarten Classes*, Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, RR-2729-SVCF, 2018. As of As of June 16, 2020: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2729.html

Little, Roderick J. A., and Donald B. Rubin, *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*, 2nd ed., Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2002.