



Facts about English Learners and the NCLB/ESSA Transition in Washington State

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

I. Demographic Overview of Foreign-Born and EL Populations in Washington State

In 2014, approximately 944,746 foreign-born individuals resided in Washington, accounting for 13 percent of the state population—comparable to the share of immigrants in the United States, as seen in Table 1. The growth rate of the foreign-born population in Washington State slowed from 91 percent in the period between 1990 and 2000 to 54 percent between 2000 and 2014.

Table 1. Foreign- and U.S.-Born Populations of Washington State and United States, 2014

	Washington State		United States	
	Foreign Born	U.S. Born	Foreign Born	U.S. Born
Number	944,746	6,116,784	42,391,794	276,465,262
Share of total population	13.4%	86.6%	13.3%	86.7%
Population Change over Time				
% change: 2000-14	53.8%	15.9%	36.3%	10.4%
% change: 1990-2000	90.7%	16.2%	57.4%	9.3%
Age Group				
Share under age 5	0.9%	7.1%	0.6%	7.1%
Share ages 5-17	6.1%	18.0%	5.3%	18.6%
Share ages 18+	93.0%	74.8%	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/WA/US/.

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

	Washington State		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
Children between ages 6 and 17 with	1,010,110	100	46,968,394	100
Only native parent(s)	740,333	73.3	35,171,703	74.9
One or more foreign-born parents	269,777	26.7	11,796,691	25.1
Child is native	226,213	22.4	10,011,547	21.3
Child is foreign born	43,564	4.3	1,785,144	3.8
Children in low-income families	577,536	100	30,272,597	100
Only native parents	374,547	64.9	20,793,941	68.7
One or more foreign-born parents	202,989	35.1	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.”

The immigrant population in Washington is growing at a somewhat higher rate than the U.S. foreign born more generally, and it outpaces the growth of the native-born population. Age group trends in Washington State mirror broader national trends, with disproportionately fewer foreign-born individuals in the birth-to-age-17 brackets compared to the native born.

With an immigrant population comparable to that of the United States, it follows that the share of school-age children with one or more foreign-born parents in Washington (27 percent) is similar to the national share (25

percent), as shown in Table 2. Additionally, about 84 percent of children of immigrants in Washington State were native born. In Washington, 35 percent of children in low-income families had foreign-born parents, compared to 31 percent of low-income children nationally.

Washington State has a diverse immigrant population, with sizeable shares coming from Asia and Latin America (see Table 3). Most notably, Washington’s share of Asian-born immigrants is larger than the U.S. share (42 percent versus 30 percent, respectively), and the state has about 1 percent fewer African-

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

Region of Birth	Washington State		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
Africa	51,754	5.5	1,931,203	4.6
Asia	395,144	41.8	12,750,422	30.1
Europe	154,723	16.4	4,764,822	11.2
Latin America	282,923	29.9	21,890,416	51.6
Northern America	44,954	4.8	812,642	1.9
Oceania	15,248	1.6	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 Washington State and U.S. LEP Students, 2014

	Share of K-12 LEP Children Born in the United States		
	Grades K-5 (%)	Grades 6-12 (%)	Total (%)
Washington State	78	55	68
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/>.

born, and 5 percent fewer European-born individuals than the country as a whole. The share of individuals born in Latin America residing in Washington (30 percent) is significantly lower than the national share (52 percent).

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,¹ 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) 2013-14.²

At the state level, ACS data indicate that 5 percent of Washington children ages 5 to 17 are LEP.³ In contrast, the most recent data from the Washington OSPI, from the October 1, 2014 count (SY 2014-15), show that 119,844 ELs were enrolled in the state, representing 11 percent of the total K-12 student population.⁴

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 Washington State and in the United States more generally, slightly more than two-thirds 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 Washington OSPI, Tables 5 through 7 describe students enrolled in the Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program (TBIP), which includes 118,526 students served in any program for ELs (including bilingual and nonbilingual program models), and excludes 1,318 ELs whose parents waived services.⁵ Table 5 shows that in SY 2014-15, Spanish was the most commonly spoken home language of TBIP students, at 67 percent, with Russian, Vietnamese, Somali, and Chinese rounding out the top five. Altogether, 215 languages were spoken by TBIP students.

Among Washington school districts with enrollment of more than 2,000 ELs, the districts with the largest number of students enrolled in TBIP for SY 2014-15 were Seattle, Pasco, Yakima, Kent, and Highline. Table 6 also shows that in the districts with the largest numbers of TBIP students, these ELs make up between 8 percent (Lake Washington) and 36 percent (Pasco) of the student population.

Finally, Table 7 shows that as grade level increases, the number and share of TBIP students in Washington K-12 schools decreases. Whereas 43 percent of early-elementary-grade students were in TBIP in SY 2015-16, that number dropped to 14 percent for grades 9-12.

Table 5. Home Languages Spoken by Washington State ELs Served in TBIP, SY 2014-15

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs (%)
Spanish	79,775	66.5
Russian	4,915	4.1
Vietnamese	4,169	3.5
Somali	3,174	2.6
Chinese (Cantonese, Fukienese, Mandarin, Taiwanese, or Unspecified)	2,748	2.3
Arabic	2,204	1.8
Ukrainian	2,095	1.7
Tagalog	1,559	1.3
Korean	1,451	1.2
Marshallese	1,392	1.2
Punjabi	1,183	1.0
Other (200 languages)	15,344	12.8

EL = English Learner; TBIP = Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program; SY = School Year.

Source: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), “Report to the Legislature. Update: Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program—Appendices” (dataset, OSPI, 2016), Appendix B, http://k12.wa.us/LegisGov/2015documents/2014-15SYELL_Appendices.xlsx.

Table 6. Number and Share of K-12 ELs Served in TBIP in Washington State Districts with More Than 2,000 ELs, SY 2014-15

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs in District (%)
Seattle	6,354	12.0
Pasco	6,130	35.9
Yakima	5,323	33.7
Kent	5,141	18.4
Highline	4,739	24.6
Federal Way	3,728	16.5
Evergreen (Clark)	3,155	11.9
Vancouver	2,976	12.7
Mukilteo	2,765	18.5
Tacoma	2,755	9.4
Renton	2,611	16.6
Kennewick	2,477	14.2
Edmonds	2,503	11.9
Auburn	2,264	14.6
Everett	2,253	11.5
Lake Washington	2,240	8.2
Bellevue	2,199	11.2
Sunnyside	2,084	31.4

EL = English Learner; TBIP = Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program; SY = School Year.

Note: Based on October 1 counts of EL students served in the TBIP and all students in the district.

Source: OSPI, “Report to the Legislature,” Appendix D.

Table 7. Number and Share of ELs Served in TBIP in Washington State, by Grade, SY 2015-16

	Grades K-2	Grades 3-5	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Share of ELs	42.5%	28.5%	15.4%	13.5%
Number of ELs	52,473	35,104	19,042	16,706

EL = English Learner; TBIP = Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program; SY = School Year.

Note: Share calculated based on 123,325 total students, as the state counted students once for each district in Washington they attended in 2014-15.

Source: OSPI, “Report to the Legislature,” Figure 5.

II. EL Student Outcomes in Washington State

As of 2014-15, Washington State was using the Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA) 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, half of all students scored as having “advanced” proficiency in English in SY 2014-15, and 17 percent scored high enough to transition out of TBIP services.

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 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 Washington ELs.

As of spring 2015, Washington State has administered the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) for accountability purposes. The SBA for ELA and mathematics are administered in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11. Washington State continues to use the Measurements of Student Progress (MSP) for science in grades 5 and 8 (the MSP was previously used for reading and math assessment in grades 3 through 8 as well). The 10th grade end-of-course (EOC) exam in biology is also used for school and district accountability purposes. For each of these assessments, there are four achievement levels, and a score at either of the two highest levels

Table 8. Share of Washington State ELs at Each WELPA Overall Performance Level (%), SY 2014-15

	Grades K-2 (%)	Grades 3-5 (%)	Grades 6-8 (%)	Grades 9-12 (%)	All Students (%)
Level 1: Beginning	4.7	2.3	2.9	4.7	3.7
Level 2: Intermediate	40.0	15.8	13.1	21.8	26.6
Level 3: Advanced	43.1	63.7	56.9	55.0	52.7
Level 4: Transitioned	12.2	18.2	27.2	18.5	17.0

EL = English Learner; WELPA = Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment; SY = School Year.

Source: OSPI, “2015 Data Files. WELPA Scores by State,” accessed December 6, 2016, <http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/DataDownload.aspx>.

Table 9. Share of Washington State ELs and All Students Meeting Standard on the SBA 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 standard	19.2	17.4	15.6	10.3	9.8	10.8	<5*
Share of all students who met standard	52.1	54.6	57.6	54.0	56.9	56.9	26.3

* Score suppressed when percentage of students is less than 5 percent.

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

Source: OSPI, "Washington State Report Card," accessed December 6, 2016, <http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/>.

indicates the student has met the academic standard.⁶

Table 9 shows considerable achievement gaps between the share of ELs and of all students who met or exceeded the standard, with that gap growing larger at successively older grade levels. The gap was smallest in 3rd grade (33 points) and largest in 7th grade (47 points).

As with ELA, there are considerable and increasing gaps between ELs and all students on the SBA mathematics assessment (see Table 10). The gap was smallest at 3rd grade (28 points) and largest in 7th grade (38 points).

Science test scores show the same pattern as ELA and math, with the gap between ELs and all students growing from 42 to 53 points between 5th and 10th grade (see Table 11).

Finally, there are wide gaps between ELs and all students in terms of graduation rates in Washington State. For the class of 2015, the four-year high school graduation rate for ELs was 56 percent compared to a rate of 78 percent for all students.⁷ The national rates for that year were 65 percent for ELs and 83 percent for all students.⁸

III. Accountability under NCLB and ESSA

Although many mechanisms within Washington State'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.

Table 10. Share of Washington State ELs and All Students Meeting Standard on the SBA 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 standard	28.7	22.6	13.4	9.1	10.2	11.7	<5*
Share of all students who met standard	56.7	54.0	48.1	45.5	48.0	46.1	13.7

* Score suppressed when percentage of students is less than 5 percent.

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

Source: OSPI, "Washington State Report Card."

Table 11. Share of Washington State ELs and All Students Meeting Standard on the MSP Science or End-of-Course (EOC) Biology, by Grade (%), SY 2014-15

	MSP Science Grade 5 (%)	MSP Science Grade 8 (%)	EOC Biology Grade 10 (%)
Share of ELs who met standard	21.5	11.9	19.7
Share of all students who met standard	63.4	60.7	72.5

EL = English Learner; MSP = Measurements of Student Progress; SY = School Year.

Source: OSPI, "Washington State Report Card."

A. Identification and Reclassification of ELs

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

If students are identified as potential ELs, they are administered the approved language-screening test—the Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA) screener. Students who score at the basic, intermediate, or advanced level (levels 1 through 3) are identified as ELs; those who score at level 4 (transitioned) are not. Starting in SY 2015-16, Washington State transitioned to using the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) for its annual testing of ELs, and will begin using the ELPA21 screener for initial classification in fall 2017.

ELs are given an English language proficiency assessment annually until they meet reclassification requirements. As per NCLB guidelines, ELPA21 tests proficiency levels in the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Students receive a score of 1 through 5 on each of these domains. To be classified as proficient and transitioned out of EL status, students must score at level 4 or 5 in each of the four domains. Students at level 2 or below in all domains will be classified as

emerging, and students in between will be classified as progressing.¹⁰

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).¹¹

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:¹²

- **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, 2016.¹³ 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/WA/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 Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), *Report to the Legislature. Update: Transitional Bilingual Instructional Program* (Olympia, WA: OSPI, 2016), <http://k12.wa.us/LegisGov/2016documents/2016-02-TransitionalBilingualInstructionProgram.pdf>.
- 5 OSPI, *Report to the Legislature*.
- 6 OSPI, “Frequently Asked Questions about State Testing,” updated October 4, 2016, www.k12.wa.us/assessment/StateTesting/FAQ.aspx.
- 7 OSPI, *Graduation and Dropout Statistics Annual Report March 2016* (Olympia, WA: OSPI, 2016), www.k12.wa.us/DataAdmin/pubdocs/GradDropout/14-15/2014-15GraduationDropoutStatisticsAnnualReport.pdf.
- 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.
- 9 OSPI, “Identifying English Language Learners: Definitions and Procedures” (guidelines, June 2015), www.k12.wa.us/MigrantBilingual/pubdocs/TBIPGuidelinesIdentification.pdf.
- 10 Superintendent of Public Instruction, “Score Reporting for English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) and Placement in the Transitional Bilingual Instruction Program (TBIP) for the 2016–17 school year” (memorandum no. 045-16M, August 25, 2016), www.k12.wa.us/BulletinsMemos/Memos2016/M045-16.docx.
- 11 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.
- 12 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; 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.
- 13 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.

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).

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.

© 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.

Information for reproducing excerpts from this report can be found at www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy. Inquiries can also be directed to communications@migrationpolicy.org.

Suggested citation: Sugarman, Julie and Kevin Lee. 2017. *Facts about English Learners and the NCLB/ESSA Transition in Washington State*. 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

