



# Facts about English Learners and the NCLB/ESSA Transition in California

By Julie Sugarman and Kevin Lee

This fact sheet provides a sketch of key characteristics of the foreign-born and English Learner (EL) populations in California. It is intended to equip community organizations with an understanding of the state demographic context and some of the basics of EL policies under the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB, in effect from 2002 through December 2015) and its successor, the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), enacted in December 2015.

The first section looks at the demographics of California, including the entire state population using U.S. Census Bureau 2014 American Community Survey (ACS) data, and EL students as reported by the California Department of Education. A discussion of EL student outcomes as measured by standardized tests follows, and the fact sheet concludes with a brief overview of California accountability mechanisms that affected ELs under NCLB and relevant provisions of ESSA.

## I. Demographic Overview of Foreign-Born and EL Populations in California

In 2014, approximately 10,512,400 foreign-born individuals resided in California, accounting for 27 percent of the state population—twice the share of immigrants in the United States (13 percent), as seen in Table 1. Historically, California has been a destination for substantial numbers of immigrants in the United States, with the state home to about one-quarter of the U.S. foreign-born population.

**Table 1. Foreign- and U.S.-Born Populations of California and United States, 2014**

	California		United States	
	Foreign Born	U.S. Born	Foreign Born	U.S. Born
Number	10,512,399	28,290,101	42,391,794	276,465,262
Share of total population	27.1%	72.9%	13.3%	86.7%
<b>Population Change over Time</b>				
% change: 2000-14	18.6%	13.1%	36.3%	10.4%
% change: 1990-2000	37.2%	7.3%	57.4%	9.3%
<b>Age Group</b>				
Share under age 5	0.5%	8.7%	0.6%	7.1%
Share ages 5-17	4.0%	22.0%	5.3%	18.6%
Share ages 18+	95.5%	69.3%	94.0%	74.3%

Source: Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Data Hub, "State Immigration Data Profiles: Demographics & Social," accessed September 8, 2016, [www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/demographics/CA/US/](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/demographics/CA/US/).

**Table 2. Children (ages 17 and younger) in California and the United States, 2014**

	California		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
<b>Children between ages 6 and 17 with</b>	<b>5,826,633</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>46,968,394</b>	<b>100</b>
Only native parent(s)	2,847,361	48.9	35,171,703	74.9
One or more foreign-born parents	2,979,272	51.1	11,796,691	25.1
Child is native born	2,619,585	45.0	10,011,547	21.3
Child is foreign born	359,687	6.2	1,785,144	3.8
<b>Children in low-income families</b>	<b>3,964,916</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30,272,597</b>	<b>100</b>
Only native parents	1,615,345	40.7	20,793,941	68.7
One or more foreign-born parents	2,349,571	59.3	9,478,656	31.3

*Note:* The definition of children in low-income families includes children under age 18 who resided with at least one parent and in families with annual incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty threshold.

*Source:* MPI Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Demographics & Social.”

Table 1 also shows that the foreign-born growth rate in California slowed from 37 percent in the period between 1990 and 2000 to 19 percent between 2000 and 2014, about half the growth rate of the U.S. immigrant population more generally. Nevertheless, the immigrant population continues to grow more rapidly than the native-born population. Age group trends in California mirror broader national trends, with disproportionately fewer foreign-born individuals in the birth-to-age-17 brackets compared to the native born.

With a large population of immigrants, it follows that the share of school-age children with one or more foreign-born parents is about twice as high in California (51 percent)

compared to the United States (25 percent), as shown in Table 2. Additionally, about 88 percent of children of immigrants in California were native born. In California, 59 percent of children in low-income families had foreign-born parents, compared to 31 percent of children nationally.

California has a diverse immigrant population, with sizeable shares coming from Asia and Latin America, which correspond to the top two regions of birth for the foreign-born population nationwide (see Table 3). California’s Asian-born population represents a somewhat larger share than for the United States overall (38 percent versus 30 percent, respectively), and the state immigrant popula-

**Table 3. Regions of Birth of the Foreign-Born Population in California and the United States, 2014**

Region of Birth	California		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
Africa	170,320	1.6	1,931,203	4.6
Asia	3,975,591	37.8	12,750,422	30.1
Europe	673,268	6.4	4,764,822	11.2
Latin America	5,481,745	52.1	21,890,416	51.6
Northern America	139,138	1.3	812,642	1.9
Oceania	72,230	0.7	241,200	0.6

*Notes:* Latin America includes South America, Central America, Mexico, and the Caribbean; Northern America includes Canada, Bermuda, Greenland, and St. Pierre and Miquelon. The region of birth data exclude those born at sea.

*Source:* MPI Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Demographics & Social.”

**Table 4. Nativity of California and U.S. LEP Students, 2014**

	Share of K-12 LEP Children Born in the United States (%)		
	Grades K-5	Grades 6-12	Total
California	87	55	72
United States	83	56	71

*Note:* Analysis based on Limited English Proficient (LEP) children ages 5 and older enrolled in grades K-12.

*Source:* MPI analysis of U.S. Census Bureau 2014 American Community Survey (ACS) data, accessed through Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota, “Integrated Public Use Microdata Series,” accessed September 8, 2016, <https://usa.ipums.org/usa/>.

tion has slightly lower African and European origins than the U.S. foreign-born population (3 percent and 5 percent fewer, respectively).

**Number of ELs.** ACS Census data on the Limited English Proficient (LEP) population rely on self-reporting of English proficiency, with LEP individuals counted as those who speak English less than “very well.” At the national level, ACS data indicate that 5 percent of U.S. children ages 5 to 17 are LEP,<sup>1</sup> while data submitted to the federal government by the states put the share of ELs amongst the total K-12 population at 10 percent in school year (SY) 2013-14.<sup>2</sup>

At the state level, ACS data indicate that 8 percent of California children ages 5 to 17 are LEP.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, the most recent data from the California Department of Education, from SY 2015-16, indicate EL enrollment represents 22 percent of the total K-12 student population, or 1,373,106 students.<sup>4</sup>

Although ACS data seem to vastly undercount EL children, they can be used to examine (with due caution) the nativity of ELs, which is not a variable captured by school data systems. Table 4 shows that in California and in the United States more generally, nearly three-quarters of school-aged children who were reported as LEP in census data were born in the United States, with a larger share among elementary school children than older students.

Turning now to data collected by the California Department of Education, Table 5 shows that in SY 2015-16, Spanish was the most commonly spoken home language of EL students in the state, at 84 percent, with Vietnamese, Mandarin Chinese, Filipino/Tagalog, and Arabic rounding out the top five. Nevertheless, 10 percent of students speak more than 60 different non-English languages.

**Table 5. Home Languages Spoken by California ELs, SY 2015-16**

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs (%)
Spanish	1,147,404	83.5
Vietnamese	30,161	2.2
Mandarin Chinese	20,048	1.5
Filipino/Tagalog	18,456	1.3
Arabic	17,689	1.3
Other	139,966	10.2

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

*Source:* California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office, “English Learner Students by Language by Grade: State of California 2015-16,” accessed September 8, 2016, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/SpringData/StudentsByLanguage.aspx?Level=State&TheYear=2015-16&SubGroup=All&ShortYear=1516&GenderGroup=B&CDSCode=00000000000000&RecordType=EL>.

**Table 6. Number and Share of K-12 ELs in California School Districts with More Than 10,000 ELs, SY 2015-16**

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs in District (%)
Los Angeles Unified	165,273	25.9
San Diego Unified	32,004	24.7
Santa Ana Unified	23,530	42.1
Long Beach Unified	17,928	23.0
Garden Grove Unified	17,745	39.2
Fresno Unified	16,439	22.4
San Francisco Unified	16,051	27.3
Oakland Unified	15,599	31.8
San Bernardino City Unified	14,449	27.1
Fontana Unified	12,692	32.8
Anaheim City School District	11,350	60.3
Stockton Unified	11,328	28.1
Elk Grove Unified	10,980	17.5
Chula Vista Elementary School District	10,802	35.7
West Contra Costa Unified	10,651	34.4
Santa Maria-Bonita School District	10,178	61.4
Coachella Valley Unified	10,103	53.6

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

Source: California Department of Education, “CALPADS Unduplicated Pupil Count (UPC) Source File 2015-16,” accessed September 8, 2016, [www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/documents/cupc1516.xls](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/documents/cupc1516.xls).

Among California school districts with enrollment of more than 10,000 ELs, the five districts with the largest number of ELs for SY 2015-16 were in southern California. Table 6 also shows that the districts with the largest numbers of ELs had shares between 18 percent (Elk Grove Unified) and 61 percent (Santa Maria-Bonita School District). Additionally, 39 school districts reported enrollment of fewer than 10,000 EL

students, yet comprising more than 60 percent of their total enrollment.

Finally, Table 7 shows that as grade level increases, the population and share of ELs in California K-12 schools decrease. Whereas one-third of early-elementary-grade students were EL in SY 2015-16, that number dropped to 8 percent for grades 9-12.

**Table 7. Number and Share of ELs in California, by Grade, SY 2015-16**

	Grades K-2	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Share of ELs	34.8%	28.6%	16.7%	8.4%
Number of ELs	500,501	409,245	235,064	227,301

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

Source: California Department of Education, “2015-16 Enrollment by English Language Acquisition Status (ELAS) and Grade: Statewide Report,” accessed September 9, 2016, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/longtermel/ELAS.aspx?cde=00&agglevel=State&year=2015-16>.

**Table 8. Share of ELs at Each CELDT Overall Performance Level (%), SY 2015-16**

	Grades K-2 (%)	Grades 3-5 (%)	Grades 6-8 (%)	Grades 9-12 (%)	All Students (%)
Beginning	8.5	8.4	8.0	11.0	9.0
Early intermediate	17.1	13.5	9.8	11.8	14.0
Intermediate	37.4	39.3	32.4	32.4	36.0
Early advanced	28.6	29.3	38.3	35.6	32.0
Advanced	8.3	9.5	11.5	9.2	9.0

EL = English Learner; CELDT = California English Language Development Test; SY = School Year.

Source: California Department of Education, "California English Language Development Test, 2015-16," updated July 27, 2016, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/CELDT/results.aspx?year=2015-2016&level=state&assessment=2&ubgroup=1&entity>.

## II. EL Student Outcomes in California

Although it is in the process of transitioning to a new test, as of SY 2015-16 California used the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) for annual assessment of students' English language proficiency. Table 8 shows the number of ELs scoring at each level, by grade band.

Across the state, two-thirds of K-12 ELs scored at the third or fourth highest of five levels during SY 2015-16, with that proportion remaining fairly constant across the grade bands.

California also reports the number of students in grades 6-12 who have been ELs for six or more years; that figure for 2015-16 was 82 percent. Additionally, California reports long-term English learners (LTELs), defined as those

who have been ELs for six or more years and who are not progressing academically; about two-thirds (63 percent) of ELs for six or more years are LTEL.<sup>5</sup>

Next, the fact sheet looks at outcomes of the EL subgroup on state standardized assessments. It is important to note two things about the participation of ELs on these assessments. First, compared to other student subgroups based on ethnicity, poverty, gender, and special education status, ELs are a much more dynamic population: as students gain proficiency, they exit the EL subgroup and new ELs are identified as they enter the U.S. school system. By definition, students who remain in the EL subgroup are not performing at a level where their achievement on mainstream assessments is comparable to that of their English-proficient peers.

Second, under NCLB, states were allowed to exempt EL students from taking the English

**Table 9. Share of California ELs and All Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard on the SBSA English Language Arts (ELA), by Grade (%), SY 2014-15**

	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 11 (%)
Share of ELs who met or exceeded standard	17.1	11.3	11.2	7.5	5.7	5.6	8.0
Share of all students who met or exceeded standard	37.5	39.5	44.8	42.8	43.6	45.2	55.8

EL = English Learner; SBSA = Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment; SY = School Year.

Source: California Department of Education, *State Accountability Report Card: Reported Using Data from the 2014-15 School Year* (Sacramento: California Department of Education, 2016), 9-15, [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sc/documents/streportcard14-15.pdf](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/sc/documents/streportcard14-15.pdf).

**Table 10. Share of California ELs and All Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard on the SBSA Mathematics, by Grade (%), SY 2014-15**

	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 11 (%)
Share of ELs who met or exceeded standard	22.0	11.4	6.5	5.6	5.8	5.9	5.1
Share of all students who met or exceeded standard	40.2	34.6	30.4	32.9	33.8	33.1	29.7

EL = English Learner; SBSA = Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment; SY = School Year.

Source: California Department of Education, *State Accountability Report Card*.

language arts (ELA) test for one year and to exclude the math scores of those newcomers from accountability reports. For that reason, the results below do not include all California ELs.

In Spring 2015, California began to administer the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment (SBSA) for accountability purposes, replacing the older California Standards Test (CST).<sup>6</sup> The SBSA for ELA and mathematics are administered in grades 3-8 and grade 11, and scores are reported at four achievement levels. Students scoring at level 3 (standard met) or level 4 (standard exceeded) are reported in Tables 9 and 10. The CST in science continues to be administered in grades 5, 8, and 10. Students scoring at level 4 (proficient) or level 5 (advanced) on the five-point scale are reported in Table 11.

Table 9 shows considerable achievement gaps between the number of ELs who met or exceeded the standard and all students, with that gap growing larger at successively older grade levels. The gap was smallest in 3rd

grade (20 points) and largest in 11th grade (48 points).

As with ELA, there are considerable and ever-increasing gaps between ELs and all students on the SBSA mathematics assessment (see Table 10). The gap was smallest at 3rd grade (18 points) and largest in 7th grade (28 points).

Science test scores show the same pattern as ELA and math, with the gap between ELs and all students rising from 33 to 41 points between 5th and 10th grade (see Table 11).

Finally, graduation rates in California have been increasing over the last five years for students overall and for subgroups such as ELs, but wide gaps remain between ELs and all students. For the class of 2015, the four-year high school graduation rate for ELs was 69 percent—up 4 percent from the previous year—compared to a rate of 82 percent for all students.<sup>7</sup> The national rates for that year were 65 percent for ELs and 83 percent for all students.<sup>8</sup>

**Table 11. Share of California ELs and All Students Scoring at Proficient or Advanced Levels on the Science CST, by Grade (%), SY 2014-15**

	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 10 (%)
Share of ELs scoring proficient or advanced	21.5	22.9	11.6
Share of all students scoring proficient or advanced	54.6	62.3	52.7

EL = English Learner; CST = California Standards Test; SY = School Year.

Source: California Department of Education, *State Accountability Report Card*.



## III. Accountability under NCLB and ESSA

Although many mechanisms within California's accountability system are in the process of changing, it is important to have a sense of the tests, benchmarks, and accommodations for ELs that have been implemented for the last 15 years in preparation for ESSA accountability planning.

### A. Identification and Reclassification of ELs

As in most states, the EL identification process in California begins with the administration of home-language surveys,<sup>9</sup> which are distributed to parents when their child enters a California school. These surveys assess whether students speak a language other than English at home, and whether their native language is one other than English.

If students are identified as potential ELs, a licensed English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher administers the approved language-screening test—California English Language Development Test (CELDT). As per NCLB guidelines, CELDT tests proficiency levels in the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The benchmark for English proficiency on the CELDT is an overall score of at least “early advanced” and “intermediate” in each of the four language domains (or listening and speaking for kindergarten and 1st grade). California will transition from the CELDT to a new assessment system, the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC), by 2018.

ELs are given the CELDT annually until they meet reclassification requirements. To be reclassified, students must meet CELDT benchmarks, plus three further requirements: (1) teacher evaluation, (2) parental opinion and consultation, and (3) comparison of EL student

performance in basic skills against the academic performance of English-proficient students of the same age.<sup>10</sup> This last point, operationalized as meeting a benchmark on the state ELA and math exams, has been particularly problematic as some districts impose higher benchmarks than others.<sup>11</sup>

### B. Accountability for EL Performance

Under Title III of NCLB, EL performance was monitored at the district and state level through Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Although these are no longer part of Title III of ESSA, states will include a measure of English proficiency and include EL subgroup scores on state grade-level assessments in their new accountability plans.

Under NCLB, states set ever-increasing targets for the number of students achieving benchmarks for the three AMAOs:

- 1) Progress (improving English proficiency from year to year)
- 2) Proficiency (exiting EL status)
- 3) Adequate yearly progress (AYP) in academic achievement for the EL subgroup (indicators included state standardized tests in reading and math, participation in assessments, and graduation rate).<sup>12</sup>

Originally, NCLB called for parental notification if districts missed AMAO targets, and the development of a school improvement plan (involving program and/or staffing changes) for schools that missed AYP targets for any subgroup (including ELs) over multiple years. The AYP benchmarks and rules for developing school improvement plans were significantly changed in many states with the NCLB waiver program instituted in 2012, and will be revised again as states create accountability plans under ESSA.

### C. Changes under ESSA

The following are some of the changes in federal law under ESSA, enacted in 2015, which affect EL students:<sup>13</sup>

- **EL accountability moved from Title III to Title I.** EL subgroup accountability for measures such as reading, math, and high school graduation rates continues to be included in district accountability under Title I, and a measure of progress in English language proficiency moved from Title III to Title I, thus giving it more weight.
- **Additional option for including recently arrived ELs in assessment.** Under NCLB, states could exempt ELs enrolled in U.S. schools for less than 12 months from taking ELA tests and exclude results of their ELA (if taken) and math tests from accountability calculations for that first year. States can continue with this option, or they can assess ELs in ELA and math in the first year but exclude their scores from accountability calculations, use a measure of growth in reading and math in the second year, and then report proficiency levels as for other students in the third year and thereafter.
- **Inclusion of former ELs in subgroup.** Under NCLB, students were included in the EL subgroup for up to two years after they had been reclassified; ESSA extends this period to up to four years.
- **Disaggregation.** States must now report the number of EL students with

disabilities who are making progress toward English proficiency and in academic achievement, and report the number of ELs who have not attained English proficiency within five years of identification.

- **Standardization of entrance and exit procedures.** States must develop standardized procedures for identifying and reclassifying EL students.

The U.S. Department of Education issued regulations regarding accountability on November 28, 2016.<sup>14</sup> These regulations also address English learners. The regulations require that states consider at least one unique student characteristic, including students' initial English language proficiency level, in determining ambitious but achievable targets for English learners' progress toward English language proficiency, within a state-determined maximum number of years. These targets are then used to set state-level, long-term goals and measurements of interim progress, and may also be used in the state's indicator of progress in achieving English language proficiency, which can include all English learners in grades K-12.

As states move forward with ESSA accountability plans, policymakers are taking the opportunity to revise existing regulations on funding, program requirements, teacher training, and other aspects of school administration. Provisions that affect the EL students should be scrutinized closely by stakeholders at all levels, whether parents, teachers, or community organizations. Data on EL demographics and performance, such as those provided in this fact sheet, will prove an important tool in this effort.



## Endnotes

- 1 Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Language & Education,” accessed September 8, 2016, [www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/language/CA/US/](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/language/CA/US/).
- 2 U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, “Table 204.27: English Language Learner (ELL) Students Enrolled in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Grade and Home Language: Selected Years, 2008-09 through 2013-14,” accessed January 17, 2017, <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/xls/tabn204.27.xls>.
- 3 MPI Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Language & Education.”
- 4 California Department of Education, “CALPADS Unduplicated Pupil Count (UPC) Source File 2015-16,” accessed September 8, 2016, [www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/documents/cupc1516.xls](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/documents/cupc1516.xls).
- 5 California Department of Education, “Long-Term English Learners by Grade,” accessed September 15, 2016, <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/longtermel/LongTerm.aspx?cde=00&agglvl=State&year=2015-16>.
- 6 Common Core State Standards Initiative, “Frequently Asked Questions,” accessed September 8, 2016, [www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/frequently-asked-questions/](http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/frequently-asked-questions/).
- 7 California Department of Education, “State Schools Chief Tom Torlakson Reports New Record High School Graduation Rate and Sixth Consecutive Year of an Increase” (news release, May 17, 2016), [www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr16/yr16rel38.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr16/yr16rel38.asp).
- 8 National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), “Common Core of Data (CCD),” updated September 15, 2016, [http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/tables/ACGR\\_RE\\_and\\_characteristics\\_2014-15.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/tables/ACGR_RE_and_characteristics_2014-15.asp).
- 9 For a sample, see California Department of Education, “Home Language Survey: English Version,” updated December 2016, [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/documents/hlsformeng.doc](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/cr/documents/hlsformeng.doc).
- 10 California Department of Education, “CELDT Frequently Asked Questions,” updated June 24, 2016, [www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/celdtfaqs.asp](http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/tg/el/celdtfaqs.asp).
- 11 Laura E. Hill, Margaret Weston, and Joseph M. Hayes, *Reclassification of English Learner Students in California* (San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California, 2014), [www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_114LHR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_114LHR.pdf).
- 12 Andrea Boyle, James Taylor, Steven Hurlburt, and Kay Soga, *Title III Accountability: Behind the Numbers. ESEA Evaluation Brief: The English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2010), [www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/behind-numbers.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/behind-numbers.pdf).
- 13 Delia Pompa, “New Education Legislation Includes Important Policies for English Learners, Potential Pitfalls for their Advocates” (commentary, MPI, December 2015), [www.migrationpolicy.org/news/new-education-legislation-includes-important-policies-english-learners-potential-pitfalls-their](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/new-education-legislation-includes-important-policies-english-learners-potential-pitfalls-their); Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), *Major Provisions of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Related to the Education of English Learners* (Washington, DC: CCSSO, 2016), [www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/CCSSOResourceonESSAELs02.23.2016.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/CCSSOResourceonESSAELs02.23.2016.pdf).
- 14 U.S. Department of Education, “Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged— Academic Assessments,” *Federal Register* 81, no. 236 (December 8, 2016): 88886, [www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-12-08/pdf/2016-29128.pdf](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-12-08/pdf/2016-29128.pdf).

## About the Authors



**Julie Sugarman** is a Policy Analyst at the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, where she focuses on issues related to immigrant and English Learner students in elementary and secondary schools. Among her areas of focus: policies, funding mechanisms, and district- and school-level practices that support high-quality instructional services for these youth, as well as the particular needs of immigrant and refugee students who first enter U.S. schools at the middle and high school levels. Dr. Sugarman earned a B.A. in anthropology and French from Bryn Mawr College, an M.A.

in anthropology from the University of Virginia, and a Ph.D. in second language education and culture from the University of Maryland, College Park.



**Kevin Lee** was a Research Intern at MPI, where he provided research support for the National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy on a variety of projects focused on domestic education policy and addressing achievement gaps among English Learners in the United States. Previously, Mr. Lee was a Research Assistant with the Islamic Center of Southern California, where he developed a three-year Islamic enrichment curriculum for Muslim-American youth. He has also worked with IDEAS@UCLA, a campus-based student advocacy and support group. He holds a B.A. in philosophy and the study of religion

from the University of California, Los Angeles.

## Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Migration Policy Institute (MPI) colleagues Jie Zong and Jeanne Batalova for their compilation of the U.S. Census Bureau data used throughout this fact sheet and to Morgan Hollie and Sarah Schwartz for their research assistance. The authors also acknowledge the support of colleagues Margie McHugh, Michelle Mittelstadt, Lauren Shaw, and Delia Pompa.

This fact sheet was developed for the National Partnership to Improve PreK-12 Success for Immigrant Children and Youth, a collaboration of state-level immigrant policy organizations working with MPI's National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy to improve the quality of education provided to English Learner (EL) children and youth. Support was provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Walton Family Foundation.

For policy and/or implementation support related to the data provided in this fact sheet, contact Delia Pompa, Senior Fellow for Education Policy at the MPI National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy ([dpompa@migrationpolicy.org](mailto:dpompa@migrationpolicy.org)).

For more information on the impact of the *Every Student Succeeds Act* on EL and immigrant students, see [www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/nciip-english-learners-and-every-student-succeeds-act](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/nciip-english-learners-and-every-student-succeeds-act).

© 2017 Migration Policy Institute.  
All Rights Reserved.

Cover Design: April Siruno, MPI  
Layout: Liz Heimann, MPI

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the Migration Policy Institute. A full-text PDF of this document is available for free download from [www.migrationpolicy.org](http://www.migrationpolicy.org).

Information for reproducing excerpts from this report can be found at [www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy). Inquiries can also be directed to [communications@migrationpolicy.org](mailto:communications@migrationpolicy.org).

Suggested citation: Sugarman, Julie and Kevin Lee. 2017. *Facts about English Learners and the NCLB/ESSA Transition in California*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

The Migration Policy Institute (MPI) is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank dedicated to the study of the movement of people worldwide. The Institute provides analysis, development, and evaluation of migration and refugee policies at the local, national, and international levels. It aims to meet the rising demand for pragmatic responses to the challenges and opportunities that migration presents in an ever more integrated world.

WWW.MIGRATIONPOLICY.ORG

