



Dual Language Learners

A Demographic and Policy Profile for Georgia

By Maki Park, Anna O'Toole, and Caitlin Katsiaficas

This fact sheet provides demographic information for the young Dual Language Learner (DLL) population in Georgia, based on Migration Policy Institute (MPI) analysis of U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) data pooled over the 2011–15 period. DLLs, defined as children ages 8 and under with at least one parent who speaks a language other than English at home, are less likely than their peers to access high-quality early childhood programs, although they stand to benefit disproportionately from such services. The fact sheet also provides information regarding English Learner (EL)¹ and non-EL academic outcomes at the fourth-grade level as a means of estimating potential lags in achievement experienced by DLLs later in their academic trajectories that may be due in part to gaps in services as well as other risk factors outlined in this sociodemographic profile.

Analysis of these data offers a snapshot of young DLLs in Georgia and some of the risks to their academic success. This is followed by a checklist of state policies that can support DLLs in early childhood education and care (ECEC) programs in an effort to provide equitable services and close later gaps in achievement. Taken together, this analysis aims to provide a basic understanding of the characteristics of the substantial DLL population in Georgia and the responsiveness of the state's policies to their needs. This fact sheet, part of a series available for 30 states, is accompanied by a national analysis of trends and key policies affecting DLLs across the United States.²

I. Demographic Overview of DLLs in Georgia

DLLs comprise 22 percent of the young child population (ages 0 to 8) in Georgia. Since 2000, Georgia has experienced a 75 percent growth in its young DLL population, as compared to a 24 percent increase nationally. As shown in Table 1, 63 percent of DLLs in Georgia live in low-income families,³ as compared with 51 percent of non-DLLs. Of parents of DLL children, 30 percent have less than a high school education, compared with 8 percent of parents of non-DLLs, indicating significant risk factors for this population. The tables in this section provide information about the substantial number and share of young DLLs in Georgia, and other key demographic characteristics for this population and their non-DLL peers.

- 1 English Learners (ELs) are defined as elementary and secondary students whose first language is not English and who have not yet attained English proficiency.
- 2 Maki Park, Anna O'Toole, and Caitlin Katsiaficas, *Dual Language Learners: A National Demographic Profile* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2017), www.migrationpolicy.org/research/dual-language-learners-national-demographic-and-policy-profile.
- 3 Families with incomes below 200 percent of the federal poverty level are considered low-income.

Table 1. Key Characteristics of DLLs, Non-DLLs, and their Parents in Georgia, 2011–15

| | Dual Language Learners in Georgia | | Non-DLL Population in Georgia | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| | Number | Share (%) | Number | Share (%) |
| Total young child population (ages 0–8) | 272,000 | 100.0 | 955,000 | 100.0 |
| Age | | | | |
| 0–2 | 88,000 | 32.4 | 298,000 | 31.2 |
| 3–4 | 65,000 | 23.9 | 215,000 | 22.5 |
| 5–8 | 119,000 | 43.7 | 442,000 | 46.3 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | |
| Hispanic | 155,000 | 57.1 | 30,000 | 3.1 |
| Asian | 42,000 | 15.3 | 12,000 | 1.2 |
| White/other | 39,000 | 14.4 | 509,000 | 53.3 |
| Black | 35,000 | 12.9 | 401,000 | 42.0 |
| American Indian | - | - | 3,000 | 0.3 |
| Income and Poverty | | | | |
| Below 100% of FPL | 95,000 | 34.9 | 270,000 | 28.2 |
| 100–199% of FPL | 76,000 | 27.9 | 216,000 | 22.6 |
| At or above 200% of FPL | 101,000 | 37.2 | 469,000 | 49.1 |
| Parental English Proficiency | | | | |
| Total parent population | 302,000 | 100.0 | 994,000 | 100.0 |
| LEP | 141,000 | 46.8 | N/A | N/A |
| Parental Educational Attainment | | | | |
| Total parent population (ages 25 and older) | 282,000 | 100.0 | 896,000 | 100.0 |
| Less than high school | 84,000 | 29.8 | 69,000 | 7.7 |
| High school diploma or equivalent | 60,000 | 21.2 | 208,000 | 23.3 |
| Some college | 53,000 | 18.6 | 307,000 | 34.3 |
| Bachelor’s degree or higher | 85,000 | 30.1 | 311,000 | 34.7 |

FPL = Federal poverty level; LEP = Limited English Proficient.

Notes: Poverty level refers to the poverty thresholds used by the Census Bureau to measure the share of the population living in poverty. English proficiency is self-reported. LEP refers to American Community Survey (ACS) respondents who indicated that they speak English less than “very well.” “-” indicates a sample size too small to generate result.

Source: Migration Policy Institute (MPI) analysis of U.S. Census Bureau pooled 2011–15 ACS data.

Table 2 lists the top five home languages spoken by parents of DLLs in Georgia, indicating significant linguistic diversity within this population. Families with speakers of lower-incidence minority languages may face particular

difficulties in gaining access to early childhood and other social services.

Extensive research has demonstrated the importance of high-quality early learning op-

Table 2. Top Five Home Languages Spoken by Parents of DLLs in Georgia, 2011–15

| | Spanish | Vietnamese | French | Chinese | Korean |
|--------------------------|---------|------------|--------|---------|--------|
| Number of DLL parents | 172,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Share of DLL parents (%) | 57.0 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.1 |

Notes: The table excludes parents of DLLs who speak English only. French includes French and Patois. Chinese includes Mandarin, Cantonese, and other Chinese languages.

Source: MPI analysis of U.S. Census Bureau pooled 2011–15 ACS data.

Table 3. Pre-K Enrollment of Children (ages 3 to 4) in Georgia, by DLL Status, 2011–15

| | DLL Number | DLL Share (%) | Non-DLL Number | Non-DLL Share (%) |
|-------------------|------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Total population | 63,000 | 100.0 | 210,000 | 100.0 |
| Enrolled in pre-K | 25,000 | 39.8 | 107,000 | 50.8 |

Note: These numbers exclude children ages 3 to 4 who were enrolled in kindergarten.
Source: MPI analysis of U.S. Census Bureau pooled 2011–15 ACS data.


opportunities in building a foundation for future success and healthy development. DLLs especially stand to benefit from participation in high-quality pre-K. However, DLLs in Georgia are enrolling in pre-K programs at lower rates than their non-DLL peers (see Table 3), which may contribute to lags in kindergarten readiness for this population.

II. Looking Beyond Early Childhood: Achievement Gaps Between ELs and Non-ELs in Georgia

The achievement gaps young DLLs may experience later in their academic trajectories can be seen in the discrepancy between the academic

outcomes of ELs and non-ELs in Georgia. As children are expected to be relatively competent in written language by the time they reach third grade, academic success beyond this point is highly dependent on students having developed foundational language skills prior to this period, underscoring the critical importance of the early years to future academic success. Fourth grade reading and math scores, taken from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), provide the earliest available indication of cross-state student performance and are widely used as a national report card to demonstrate how students are performing academically across the United States. In Georgia, ELs have substantially lower scores in both reading and math compared with their native peers in fourth grade (see Figure 1). This disparity in outcomes points to the importance of early childhood interventions that seek to place all young children on equal footing academically.

Figure 1. Fourth Grade Reading and Math NAEP Scores in Georgia, by EL Status, 2015



NAEP = National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, “NAEP Data Explorer—Math and Reading Assessments, 2015,” accessed March 8, 2017, <https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>.

Table 4. System-Level DLL-Related Policies in Georgia, 2017

| Bilingual education (mandatory, prohibited, or no law) | No law |
|---|--------|
| State Quality Rating and Improvement System (if any) includes criteria specific to supporting DLLs | ✓ |
| State has specific policies or guidelines pertaining to DLLs/ELs for the administration of Kindergarten Entry or Readiness Assessments (if any) | ✓* |

* Georgia Kindergarten Entry Assessment policy allows for accommodations for DLLs.

Sources: Georgia Department of Education, *Georgia Student Assessment Program—Student Assessment Handbook, 2015–2016* (Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education, 2015), [http://upson.ss6.sharpschool.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_10189249/File/Departments/Assessment/Student%20Assessment%20Handbook%202015-2016%20August%202015\(9\).pdf](http://upson.ss6.sharpschool.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_10189249/File/Departments/Assessment/Student%20Assessment%20Handbook%202015-2016%20August%202015(9).pdf); Survey of state early learning agencies administered by MPI researchers in April 2017.

III. Early Childhood Education and Care Policies Affecting DLLs in Georgia

The checklists of ECEC policies in this section show many—though not all—of the resources, supports, and information that can be made available at the state level to provide equitable, high-quality ECEC services and programs for DLLs and their families. In the tables, a check mark indicates the presence of a policy.

A. System-Level Policies

While state ECEC systems across the United States are highly complex, with disparate programs often working in relative isolation from one another, a few system-level policies can affect services and outcomes for DLLs and their families by influencing multiple aspects of the field. For example, while most states do not have laws governing bilingual approaches to

education in early childhood classrooms, some explicitly prohibit bilingual education, which can undermine support for DLLs across state ECEC systems. On the other end of the spectrum, several states have laws mandating bilingual education in schools that enroll a substantial number of DLLs, promoting awareness of DLLs’ learning strengths and needs. Similarly, Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS), which states increasingly use to create an overarching definition of quality for all early childhood programs, can determine whether diverse linguistic and cultural needs are valued across ECEC programs. The list in Table 4, while not intended to be exhaustive, includes some of the key policies in Georgia that have system-level implications for DLLs in early childhood.

B. Child Care and Development Fund Usage in Georgia

Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) resources are allocated by the federal government

Table 5. Georgia Services for LEP Families Seeking Child-Care Assistance, 2016

| | |
|---|---|
| Application in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Informational materials in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Training and technical assistance in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Website in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Lead agency accepts applications at community-based locations | ✓ |
| Bilingual caseworkers or translators | ✓ |
| Bilingual outreach workers | ✓ |
| Partnerships with community-based organizations | ✓ |

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Care, “Georgia Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) Plan with Conditional Approval Letter for FY 2016-2018,” June 27, 2016, www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/occ/Georgia_stplan_pdf_2016.pdf.

Table 6. Georgia Services for LEP Child-Care Providers, 2016

| | |
|--|---|
| Informational materials in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Training and technical assistance in non-English languages | ✓ |
| CCDF health and safety requirements in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Provider contracts in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Website in non-English languages | ✓ |
| Bilingual caseworkers or translators | ✓ |

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Care, "Georgia Child Care Development Fund (CCDF) Plan with Conditional Approval Letter for FY 2016-2018."

to states with the intention of improving access to high-quality child-care services for low-income families. Each state's CCDF plan includes information regarding supports for Limited English Proficient (LEP) families and child-care providers. Strong language access and outreach policies are critical supports that enable LEP parents to access high-quality child care (see Table 5).

Beyond seeking to reach LEP families, states can also use CCDF funds to offer linguistic and cultural support and targeted technical assistance for LEP child-care providers (see Table 6). By providing these services, states can increase their supply of culturally and linguistically responsive care and bolster diversity in the child-care workforce.

C. Home Visiting in Georgia

The federal Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) program supports grants to all 50 states and the District of Columbia, offering crucial assistance to low-income families with young children through regular home visits and access to health, social service, and child development professionals.

These supports can be particularly effective for immigrant and LEP parents of young children who are relatively isolated and are not accessing other public services. Collecting state-level data on the participation of different subgroups in the MIECHV program is critical in order to understand potential gaps in services and barriers to access for minority populations, including young DLLs and their families (see Table 7). Data collection at the state level makes it possible to identify disparities in participation and to improve programs in order to promote equitable access.

D. Pre-K and Early Learning in Georgia

Forty-three states and the District of Columbia have publicly funded preschool programs. Research has consistently shown that DLLs stand to benefit disproportionately from attending high-quality preschool. As such, it is important to understand how state policies might support or impede DLLs' access to high-quality pre-K (see Table 8).

Dual Language Learners now comprise a substantial proportion of the young child population in most states, including Georgia. As the

Table 7. Georgia Home Visiting Data Collection, 2016

| Georgia MIECHV program collects the following information about participating families: | |
|---|----|
| Race/ethnicity | ✓ |
| Home language spoken | ✓ |
| Limited English Proficient (LEP) status | No |

MIECHV = Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting.

Source: Survey of state home visiting agencies administered by MPI researchers in April 2017.

Table 8. Early Learning Policies that Support DLLs in Georgia, 2015

| The state: | | Number of States* that follow this policy |
|--|----|---|
| Uses home language as eligibility criteria for publicly funded pre-K | No | 12 out of 51 |
| Tracks enrollment of DLLs in state pre-K program | ✓ | 22 out of 51 |
| Can report DLL enrollment by home language | No | 14 out of 51 |
| Provides recruitment and enrollment materials in non-English languages | No | 17 out of 51 |
| Requires DLLs in state pre-K program to be assessed in their home language | No | 6 out of 51 |
| Requires pre-K teachers to have qualifications related to DLLs | No | 5 out of 51 |
| Allocates extra state pre-K program resources to serve DLLs | No | 9 out of 51 |

* Data in this column include the District of Columbia.

Source: W. Steven Barnett et al., *The State of Preschool 2015: State Preschool Yearbook* (New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research, 2016), http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Yearbook_2015_rev1.pdf.

population of young children who speak a language other than English at home and are learning English as a second or third language continues to grow, early childhood policies

that support cultural and linguistic diversity and meet the unique learning needs of DLLs are crucial to ensuring equal access to high-quality programs for all.

About the Authors



Maki Park is a Policy Analyst and Program Coordinator with the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, where she works on domestic and comparative issues affecting children of immigrants and Dual Language Learners in early childhood.



Anna O'Toole is a Program Assistant at the MPI National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, where she provides program support on immigrant education and workforce policy.



Caitlin Katsiaficas is a Research Assistant at MPI, where she works with the National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy. Her research focuses on policies and practices that support the successful integration of immigrant and refugee families, particularly Dual Language Learners and the young children of refugees.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Alliance for Early Success for its support of this work. They also acknowledge the contributions of their MPI colleagues, including Michelle Mittelstadt, Lauren Shaw, Margie McHugh, Jeanne Batalova, Jie Zong, and Lauren Hodges.

© 2017 Migration Policy Institute.
All Rights Reserved.

Design: April Siruno, MPI
Layout: Liz Heimann

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 publication can be found at www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copy-right-policy. Inquiries can also be directed to communications@migrationpolicy.org.

Suggested citation: Park, Maki, Anna O'Toole, and Caitlin Katsiaficas. 2017. *Dual Language Learners: A Demographic and Policy Profile for Georgia*. 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

