



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

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

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

In 2014, approximately 4,522,428 foreign-born individuals resided in Texas, accounting for 17 percent of the state population—slightly higher than the share of immigrants in the United States (13 percent), as seen in Table 1. Historically, Texas has been a destination for substantial numbers of immigrants in the United States, with the state home to about one-tenth of the U.S. foreign-born population.

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

	Texas		United States	
	Foreign Born	U.S. Born	Foreign Born	U.S. Born
Number	4,522,428	22,434,530	42,391,794	276,465,262
Share of total population	16.8%	83.2%	13.3%	86.7%
<b>Population Change over Time</b>				
% change: 2000-14	56.0%	25.0%	36.3%	10.4%
% change: 1990-2000	90.2%	16.1%	57.4%	9.3%
<b>Age Group</b>				
Share under age 5	0.7%	8.5%	0.6%	7.1%
Share ages 5-17	6.1%	21.8%	5.3%	18.6%
Share ages 18+	93.2%	69.6%	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/TX/US/](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/demographics/TX/US/).

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

	Texas		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
<b>Children between ages 6 and 17 with</b>	<b>4,502,454</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>46,968,394</b>	<b>100</b>
Only native parent(s)	2,900,836	64.4	35,171,703	74.9
One or more foreign-born parents	1,601,618	35.6	11,796,691	25.1
Child is native born	1,367,182	30.4	10,011,547	21.3
Child is foreign born	234,436	5.2	1,785,144	3.8
<b>Children in low-income families</b>	<b>3,274,137</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>30,272,597</b>	<b>100</b>
Only native parents	1,805,939	55.2	20,793,941	68.7
One or more foreign-born parents	1,468,198	44.8	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 Texas slowed from 90 percent in the period between 1990 and 2000 to 56 percent between 2000 and 2014, a rate that still far outpaces the growth of the U.S. foreign born more generally. Nevertheless, the immigrant population—both in Texas and nationwide—continues to grow more rapidly than the native-born population. Age group trends in Texas 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 higher in Texas (36 percent) compared to the United States (25 percent), as shown in Table 2. Additionally, about 85 percent of children of immigrants in Texas were native born. In Texas, 45 percent of children in low-income families had foreign-born parents, compared to 31 percent of low-income children nationally.

Texas has a less diverse immigrant population than other large states, with slightly more than two-thirds of foreign-born individuals coming from Latin America compared to about half nationwide (see Table 3). It follows that Texas’s Asian-born population is

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

Region of Birth	Texas		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
Africa	189,368	4.2	1,931,203	4.6
Asia	916,486	20.3	12,750,422	30.1
Europe	199,901	4.4	4,764,822	11.2
Latin America	3,160,036	69.9	21,890,416	51.6
Northern America	43,518	1.0	812,642	1.9
Oceania	13,119	0.3	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 Texas and U.S. LEP Students, 2014**

	Share of K-12 LEP Children Born in the United States (%)		
	Grades K-5	Grades 6-12	Total
Texas	89	65	79
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/>.

lower than the U.S. share (20 percent versus 30 percent, respectively), and that the share of European-born immigrants in Texas is less than half of the national share.

**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 9 percent of Texas children ages 5 to 17 are LEP.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, the most recent data from the Texas Education Agency, from SY 2015-16, indicate EL enrollment represents 19 percent of the total preK-12 student population, or 980,487 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 Texas, more than 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. The share of native-born students in the United States was somewhat lower at both the elementary and secondary school level.

Turning now to data collected by the Texas Education Agency, Table 5 shows that in SY 2015-16, Spanish was the most commonly spoken home language of EL students, at 90 percent, with Vietnamese, Arabic, Urdu, and Mandarin Chinese rounding out the top five non-English languages. ELs with a home language listed as English are likely English dominant students living in a home where English and one or more other languages are spoken. Finally, 5

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

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs (%)
Spanish	885,367	90.4
Vietnamese	16,045	1.6
Arabic	10,623	1.1
English	8,312	0.8
Urdu	4,809	0.5
Mandarin Chinese	4,364	0.4
Other	49,828	5.1

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

*Note:* The total is calculated based on 979,348 ELs for whom a language was reported.

*Source:* Texas Education Agency, “PEIMS Standard Reports. ELL Students by Language and Grade,” updated November 16, 2015, [https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard\\_Reports.html](https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard_Reports.html).

**Table 6. Number and Share of ELs in Texas School Districts with More Than 15,000 ELs, SY 2015-16**

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs in District (%)
Dallas ISD	68,019	42.9
Houston ISD	65,305	30.3
Fort Worth ISD	26,940	30.9
Aldine ISD	23,907	34.0
Austin ISD	23,298	27.9
Alief ISD	19,346	40.9
Cypress-Fairbanks ISD	17,510	15.4
United ISD	17,236	39.4
Pasadena ISD	16,760	29.9
Arlington ISD	16,515	26.1
El Paso ISD	16,303	27.2
Brownsville ISD	15,767	33.0
La Joya ISD	15,166	51.3
Garland ISD	15,091	26.2

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year; ISD = Independent School District.

Note: The total is calculated based on 980,253 ELs in districts with at least five ELs.

Source: Texas Education Agency, “PEIMS Standard Reports. Student Program Reports (Statewide District Totals),” updated November 16, 2015, [https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard\\_Reports.html](https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard_Reports.html).

percent of students speak one of more than 122 other languages.

Among Texas school districts with enrollment of more than 15,000 ELs, the five districts with the largest number of ELs in SY 2015-16 were Dallas, Houston, Fort Worth, Aldine, and Austin. As Table 6 shows, in the districts with the largest numbers of ELs these students make up between 15 percent (Cypress-Fairbanks ISD) and 51 percent (La Joya ISD) of the student population.

Finally, Table 7 shows that as grade level increases, the share of ELs decreases, from 40 percent in Pre-K to 8 percent in high school.

## II. EL Student Outcomes in Texas

Texas uses the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) for annual assessment of students’ English language proficiency. Table 8 shows the number of ELs scoring at each level, by grade band.

For SY 2015-16, kindergarten through 2nd grade students are evenly distributed between beginning, intermediate, and the two advanced levels. In contrast, in grades 3 through 12, three-quarters of ELs were at one of the two advanced levels.

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

	Pre-K	Grades K-2	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Share of ELs	39.9%	27.4%	23.7%	14.1%	7.8%
Number of ELs	88,369	328,340	284,018	163,994	115,656

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

Sources: Texas Education Agency, *Enrollment in Texas Public Schools, 2015-16* (Austin: Texas Education Agency, 2016), 15, [http://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll\\_2015-16.pdf](http://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll_2015-16.pdf); Texas Education Agency, “PEIMS Standard Reports. ELL Students by Category and Grade,” updated November 16, 2015, [https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard\\_Reports.html](https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard_Reports.html).

**Table 8. Share of ELs at Each TELPAS Composite Rating (%), SY 2015-16**

	Grades K-2 (%)	Grades 3-12 (%)
Beginning	32	5
Intermediate	32	19
Advanced	23	42
Advanced High	14	34

EL = English Learner; TELPAS = Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System; SY = School Year. Source: Texas Education Agency, “TELPAS Statewide Summary Reports—Spring 2016,” accessed January 5, 2017, <http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/ell/telpas/rpt/sum/>.

Data from the spring 2016 report of statewide TELPAS results also allow for the calculation of the share of students in grades 6 to 12 who are considered long-term English learners—those who have been identified as EL for six or more years; that figure for SY 2015-16 was 71 percent of ELs.<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 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 Texas ELs.

Texas administers the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) for accountability purposes. STAAR assessments are given in reading and math in grades 3 to 8, writing in grades 4 and 7, science in grades 5 and 8, and social studies in grade 8. End-of-course (EOC) assessments are also given for English I, English II, Algebra I, Biology, and U.S. History. Students may take the STAAR assessments in Spanish in reading, math, writing, and science in grades 3, 4, and 5. There are three academic performance levels for the STAAR: level 1 (unsatisfactory), level 2 (satisfactory), and level 3 (advanced); students at levels 2 and 3 are considered to have passed the exams.<sup>6</sup>

Table 9 shows moderate achievement gaps between ELs and all students on the STAAR

**Table 9. Share of Texas ELs and All Students Passing the STAAR Reading and Writing, by Grade (%), SY 2015-16**

	Reading						Writing	
	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 7 (%)
Share of ELs passing	65	62	66	42	37	61	58	35
Share of all students passing	73	75	81	69	71	87	69	69

EL = English Learner; STAAR = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness; SY = School Year. Source: Texas Education Agency, “Texas Academic Performance Report, 2014-15 State Performance,” accessed January 5, 2017, <https://rptsrv1.tea.texas.gov/perfreport/tapr/2016/state.pdf>.

**Table 10. Share of Texas ELs and All Students Passing the STAAR Mathematics, by Grade (%), SY 2015-16**

	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 8 (%)
Share of ELs passing	70	66	80	56	44	67
Share of all students passing	75	73	86	72	69	82

EL = English Learner; STAAR = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness; SY = School Year.  
 Source: Texas Education Agency, "Texas Academic Performance Report."

reading tests in elementary school (8 to 15 points), with larger gaps of 26 to 34 points in the middle school grades. Likewise, ELs scored 11 points lower than the all-student average in grade 4 and 34 points lower in grade 7.

In math, there are modest gaps of 5 to 7 points between ELs and all students in elementary school (see Table 10). In middle school, the gaps widen to between 15 and 25 points.

In science, ELs scored 14 and 28 points lower than all students in grades 5 and 8, respectively. The gap between ELs and all students

was larger, at 32 points, on the 8th grade social studies test (see Table 11).

Table 12 shows greater gaps between ELs and all students on the high school end-of-course exams in English I (33 points) and English II (39 points) than for Algebra I (18 points), Biology (21 points), and U.S. History (21 points).

Finally, there are wide gaps between ELs and all students in high school graduation rates in Texas. For the class of 2015, the four-year high school graduation rate for all students was 89 percent. Students who had been classified as EL at any time in grades 9-12 gradu-

**Table 11. Share of Texas ELs and All Students Passing the STAAR Science and Social Studies, by Grade (%), SY 2015-16**

	Science		Social Studies
	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 8 (%)
Share of ELs passing	60	47	31
Share of all students passing	74	75	63

EL = English Learner; STAAR = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness; SY = School Year.  
 Source: Texas Education Agency, "Texas Academic Performance Report."

**Table 12. Share of Texas ELs and All Students Passing the STAAR End-of-Course Exams (%), SY 2015-16**

	English I (%)	English II (%)	Algebra I (%)	Biology (%)	U.S. History (%)
Share of ELs passing	32	28	60	66	70
Share of all students passing	65	67	78	87	91

EL = English Learner; STAAR = State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness; SY = School Year.  
 Source: Texas Education Agency, "Texas Academic Performance Report."

ated at a rate of 73 percent and those who were EL in their last year of high school graduated at a rate of 72 percent.<sup>7</sup> The national rates for that year were 65 percent for ELs and 83 percent for all students.<sup>8</sup>

### III. Accountability under NCLB and ESSA

Although many mechanisms within Texas'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 Texas begins with the administration of a home-language survey, which is administered to parents when their child enters a Texas school. This survey asks parents what language is spoken at home most of the time and what language the child speaks most of the time.

Each district convenes a language proficiency assessment committee—which includes parent representatives—to review EL classification criteria for each student and assign a language proficiency level and placement in a program of instruction. For initial classification, students who are identified as potential ELs through the home-language survey are given oral and reading/writing assessments, which the district must select from a list of approved tests that is updated each year by the Texas Education Agency. The agency also provides guidelines on what levels of each test should result in the designation of a student as an EL. Students may

not be exited from EL status in kindergarten, but in 1st through 12th grade, students may be reclassified based on their scores on a state-approved oral language proficiency test, the STAAR or other state-approved reading/writing test, and a teacher evaluation.<sup>9</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>10</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>11</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>12</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/TX/US/](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/language/TX/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 Texas Education Agency, “PEIMS Standard Reports. Student Program Reports,” updated November 16, 2015, [https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard\\_Reports.html](https://rptsvr1.tea.texas.gov/adhocrpt/Standard_Reports.html).
- 5 This share was calculated from all ELs in grades 6 to 12 who were rated in all language areas and given a composite rating (N=272,486). See Texas Education Agency, “TELPAS Statewide Summary Reports—Spring 2016,” accessed January 5, 2017, <http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/ell/telpas/rpt/sum/>.
- 6 Texas Education Agency, “State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR®)—STAAR Frequently Asked Questions,” updated May 17, 2016, <http://tea.texas.gov/student.assessment/staar/>.
- 7 Texas Education Agency, “Four-Year Graduation and Dropout Data, Class of 2015,” updated August 2016, <http://tea.texas.gov/acctres/completion/2015/level.html>.
- 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 Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 89, Subchapter BB, “Commissioner’s Rules Concerning State Plan for Educating English Language Learners,” updated May 2012, <http://tea.texas.gov/Work-Area/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=2147506971&libID=2147506964>.
- 10 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).
- 11 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/CCSSOResourceonESSAELLS02.23.2016.pdf](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/CCSSOResourceonESSAELLS02.23.2016.pdf).
- 12 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 Texas*. 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

