



English Learners in Michigan

Demographics, Outcomes, and State Accountability Policies

By Julie Sugarman and Courtney Geary

This fact sheet provides an overview of key characteristics of the foreign-born and English Learner (EL) populations in Michigan. It aims to build understanding of the state demographic context, how ELs are performing in K-12 schools, and the basics of state policies for EL education under the federal *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), enacted in December 2015. The transition to ESSA is ongoing, with states slated to update their data reporting systems by December 2018. As a result, the data this fact sheet uses to describe student outcomes primarily reflect systems and accountability policies developed under the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB, in effect from 2002 through 2015). Many of the changes expected as ESSA is implemented will improve the accuracy and availability of these data.

The first section examines the demographics of Michigan using U.S. Census Bureau 2016 American Community Survey (ACS) data, and EL students as reported by the Michigan 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 Michigan accountability mechanisms that affect ELs under ESSA.

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

In 2016, approximately 662,000 foreign-born individuals resided in Michigan, accounting for 7 percent of the state population—a smaller share compared to immigrants in the United States overall (14 percent), as seen in Table 1. The growth rate of the foreign-born population in Michigan slowed from 47 percent in the period between 1990 and 2000 to 27 percent between 2000 and 2016, a rate smaller than that of the U.S. immigrant population more generally. Nevertheless, the growth rate of Michigan's foreign-born population far outpaces the growth rate of the native-born population. Age group trends in Michigan mirror broader national trends, with disproportionately smaller shares of foreign-born individuals in the birth-to-age-17 brackets compared to the native born.

With a relatively small population of immigrants, it follows that the share of school-age children with one or more foreign-born parents is smaller in Michigan (13 percent) than in the United States overall (26 percent), as shown in Table 2. Additionally, about 82 percent of children of immigrants in Michigan were native born, compared to 86 percent nationwide. In Michigan, 15 percent of children in low-income families had one or more foreign-born parents, which is about half the size of the share of low-income children nationally.

Table 1. Foreign- and U.S.-Born Populations of Michigan and the United States, 2016

	Michigan		United States	
	Foreign Born	U.S. Born	Foreign Born	U.S. Born
Number	662,279	9,266,021	43,739,345	279,388,170
Share of total population	6.7%	93.3%	13.5%	86.5%
Population Change over Time				
% change: 2000-16	26.5%	-1.6%	40.6%	11.6%
% change: 1990-2000	47.3%	5.3%	57.4%	9.3%
Age Group				
Share under age 5	0.9%	6.1%	0.7%	7.0%
Share ages 5-17	7.0%	17.0%	5.1%	18.5%
Share ages 18+	92.1%	76.9%	94.2%	74.5%

Source: Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Demographics & Social,” accessed May 16, 2018, www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/demographics/MI/US/.

Number of ELs. ACS 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 the states submitted to the federal government put the EL share of the total K-12 population at 10 percent in Fall 2015.²

At the state level, ACS data indicate that 2 percent of Michigan children ages 5 to 17 are LEP.³ In contrast, the most recent data from the Michigan Department of Education, from school year (SY) 2017–18, indicate ELs represented 6 percent of the state K-12 student population, or 97,838 students.⁴

Table 2. Nativity and Low-Income Status of Children in Michigan and the United States, 2016

	Michigan		United States	
	Number	Share of Population (%)	Number	Share of Population (%)
Children between ages 6 and 17 with	1,421,502	100.0	47,090,847	100.0
Only native-born parents	1,234,083	86.8	34,838,528	74.0
One or more foreign-born parents	187,419	13.2	12,252,319	26.0
Child is native born	153,294	10.8	10,501,024	22.3
Child is foreign born	34,125	2.4	1,751,295	3.7
Children in low-income families	858,605	100.0	28,363,805	100.0
Only native-born parents	727,639	84.7	19,216,957	67.8
One or more foreign-born parents	130,966	15.3	9,146,848	32.2

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 3. Nativity of Michigan and U.S. LEP Students, 2012–16

	Share of K-12 LEP Children Born in the United States (%)		
	Grades K-5	Grades 6-12	Total
Michigan	71.7	56.6	63.7
United States	82.3	56.5	70.6

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 pooled 2012–16 American Community Survey (ACS) data, accessed through Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota, “Integrated Public Use Microdata Series,” accessed April 25, 2018, <https://usa.ipums.org/usa/>.

Although ACS data seem to undercount EL children, they can be used to examine (with due caution) the nativity of ELs, a variable school data systems do not capture. Table 3 shows that in Michigan, almost 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. The rate of native-born LEP children in the United States overall was somewhat higher, at 71 percent.

The most recent data available that show the top languages spoken by ELs in Michigan come from the Consolidated State Performance Reports submitted by each state to the federal government. Table 4 shows that in SY 2015–16

Spanish was spoken by approximately 40 percent of Michigan ELs, and Arabic was spoken by the second-largest share at 24 percent. Bengali, Chinese, and Albanian rounded out the top five languages.

Among Michigan school districts with enrollment of more than 1,500 ELs, four of the top five districts with the largest number of ELs were located within the Detroit metropolitan area (Grand Rapids being the exception). Table 5 also shows that in the districts with the most ELs, these students made up between 9 percent (Ann Arbor Public Schools) and 61 percent (School District of the City of Hamtramck) of total enrollment.

Table 4. Top Home Languages Spoken by Michigan ELs, SY 2015–16

	Number of ELs	Share of ELs with a Home Language Other Than English (%)
Spanish; Castilian	35,912	40.2
Arabic	21,201	23.7
Bengali	2,300	2.6
Chinese	1,639	1.8
Albanian	1,632	1.8

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

Note: Share calculated based on 89,376 Limited English Proficient (LEP) students reported by the state in 2015–16. *Source:* U.S. Department of Education, “SY 2015-2016 Consolidated State Performance Reports Part I— Michigan,” updated October 18, 2017, www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/sy15-16part1/index.html.

Table 5. Number of ELs and EL Share of Students in Michigan School Districts with More Than 1,500 ELs, SY 2017–18

	Number of ELs	EL Share of Students in District (%)
Dearborn City School District	9,886	47.3
Detroit Public Schools Community District	6,130	12.0
Grand Rapids Public Schools	4,357	26.6
Warren Consolidated Schools	4,147	29.6
Utica Community Schools	3,244	11.9
Troy School District	2,220	16.8
School District of the City of Hamtramck	1,992	60.7
Kentwood Public Schools	1,903	20.8
Lansing Public School District	1,852	17.1
Ann Arbor Public Schools	1,586	8.9
Melvindale-North Allen Park Schools	1,528	49.9

EL = English Learners, SY = School Year.

Note: To access the data used to create this table, select in the report settings section “2017–18” for school year and “Student Count” for data files.

Source: Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—K-12 Student Data File,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/EntitySummary/SchoolDataFile.aspx.

Finally, Table 6 shows that as grade level increases, the population and share of ELs in Michigan K-12 schools generally decrease. Whereas 9 percent of early-elementary students were ELs in SY 2017–18, 5 percent of students in grades 9 through 12 were. This reflects the trend that more students achieve English proficiency (and thus exit EL status) over time than immigrate to the United States as adolescents or remain ELs beyond the typical five- to seven-year time frame.

II. EL Student Outcomes in Michigan

Michigan uses the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs⁵ for annual assessment of students’ English language proficiency. Table 7 shows the share of ELs achieving English language proficiency in SY 2016–17, by grade band.⁶

Across the state, 20 percent of K-12 ELs reached proficiency in SY 2016–17. The share was

Table 6. Number of ELs and EL Share of Students in Michigan, by Grade, SY 2017–18

	Grades K-2	Grades 3–5	Grades 6–8	Grades 9–12
EL share of students in grade band	8.8%	8.4%	5.7%	4.7%
Number of ELs	28,612	27,374	19,208	22,367

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

Source: Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—Student Count,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/StudentInformation/StudentCounts/StudentCount.aspx.

Table 7. Share of Michigan ELs Achieving English Language Proficiency (%), by Grade, SY 2016–17

	Kindergarten (%)	Grades 1–2 (%)	Grades 3–5 (%)	Grades 6–8 (%)	Grades 9–12 (%)	All Students (%)
Share of ELs achieving proficiency	9.7	14.9	30.8	18.4	17.3	19.9

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year.

Source: Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—WIDA Proficiency,” accessed June 6, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/Wida2/WidaAccess/WidaProficiency.aspx.

highest in late elementary school (grades 3 to 5) and decreased in middle and high school.

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. Whereas this lag is expected for students in their first several years of learning English, concerns about the significant numbers of long-term ELs—those identified as ELs for six or more years—not scoring proficient in English language arts (ELA) and math have driven policymakers to strengthen the ways they hold schools accountable for EL outcomes on academic assessments.

Second, under NCLB, states were allowed to exempt newly arrived EL students from taking the 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 Michigan ELs. The rules for including newly arrived ELs in reports on subgroup outcomes will change as ESSA provisions go into effect in 2018 (see “Accountability for EL Academic Achievement” below).

Michigan administers the Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress (M-STEP) for accountability purposes. The M-STEP for ELA and math are given in grades 3 to 8; science in grades 5, 8, and 11; and social studies in grades 5, 8, and 11. In 2017—the year for which results are given in this section—the science test was given in grades 4, 7, and 11. Outcomes are reported as four levels: not proficient, partially proficient, proficient, and advanced.⁷ Students also take the College Board SAT as part of the Michigan Merit Examination for high school students, with scores reported using the same levels as the M-STEP.⁸

Table 8 shows considerable achievement gaps between the share of ELs and of non-ELs who scored proficient or advanced in reading, with that gap growing larger at older grade levels. The gap was smallest in 3rd grade (11 points) and largest on the grade 11 SAT reading and writing (46 points).

Table 8. Share of Michigan ELs and Non-ELs Scoring Proficient or Advanced in English Language Arts (%), by Grade, SY 2016–17

	MSTEP English Language Arts						SAT Reading and Writing
	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 11 (%)
Share of ELs scoring proficient or advanced	34.0	22.9	24.5	14.0	15.8	21.5	16.1
Share of non-ELs scoring proficient or advanced	45.3	45.9	53.0	45.5	46.6	49.6	61.9

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year

Source: Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—Grades 3-8 Assessments—Proficiency,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/AssessmentResults/AssessmentGradesProficiency.aspx; Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—High School Assessments—Proficiency,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/AssessmentResults/AssessmentHighSchoolProficiency.aspx.

As with ELA, there are considerable gaps between ELs and non-ELs on the MSTEP and SAT math assessments (see Table 9). The gaps generally grew larger with grade level, increasing from 6 points (grade 3) to 26 points (grade 11).

Science and social studies test scores also show considerable gaps between ELs and non-ELs (see Table 10). For science, less than 5 percent of ELs reached the proficient or advanced level at each grade, even as the share of non-ELs scoring proficient or advanced increased in successively older grades. In the social studies test, by comparison, ELs only fell below the 5-percent mark in grade 5. The

gap between ELs and non-ELs was smallest in grade 5 (approximately 18 to 23 points) and largest in grade 11 (37 points).

Finally, graduation rates in Michigan have been increasing over the last five years for students overall and for subgroups such as ELs, though the EL rate decreased slightly for the class of 2017. The share of ELs to graduate within four years was 69 percent, compared to a four-year graduation rate of 80 percent for all students.⁹ These rates are comparable to those at the national level for the most recent year available (SY 2015–16), which were 67 percent for ELs and 84 percent for all students.¹⁰

Table 9. Share of Michigan ELs and Non-ELs Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Mathematics (%), by Grade, SY 2016–17

	MSTEP Mathematics						SAT Math
	Grade 3 (%)	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 6 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 11 (%)
Share of ELs scoring proficient or advanced	41.7	25.5	15.3	13.4	13.0	14.2	12.2
Share of non-ELs scoring proficient or advanced	47.4	43.4	36.5	35.6	37.7	34.7	37.8

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year

Source: Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—Grades 3-8 Assessments;” Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—High School Assessments.”

Table 10. Share of Michigan ELs and Non-ELs Scoring Proficient or Advanced in Science and Social Studies (%), by Grade, SY 2016–17

	Science			Social Studies		
	Grade 4 (%)	Grade 7 (%)	Grade 11 (%)	Grade 5 (%)	Grade 8 (%)	Grade 11 (%)
Share of ELs scoring proficient or advanced	<5*	<5	<5	<5	7.8	10.2
Share of non-ELs scoring proficient or advanced	15.5	24.0	34.7	22.9	32.9	47.3

EL = English Learner; SY = School Year

*The state does not provide an exact percentage when a share is less than 5 percent of students.

Source: Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—Grades 3-8 Assessments;” Michigan Department of Education, “MI School Data—High School Assessments.”

III. Accountability under ESSA

In 2017, all 50 states (plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) submitted plans to the U.S. Department of Education that outline their approach to complying with new accountability regulations under ESSA. Among the new requirements are provisions requiring states to standardize how they identify students for and exit them from EL status, extending the number of years schools can include former ELs’ scores in reporting on the outcomes of the EL subgroup, and allowing states to develop their own English language proficiency indicator (replacing the three required Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives in NCLB). Implementation of the new policies began in SY 2017–18. However, as many states have adopted new or significantly revised English language proficiency assessments over the last few years, some intend to wait to update their English language proficiency benchmarks until they have collected sufficient data from the new assessments.

Learn More about ELs and ESSA

For additional analysis, maps, and state-level data on English Learner education in the United States, check out the [MPI ELL Information Center](#) and its [ESSA resources](#).

A. Identification and Reclassification of ELs

Following federal guidelines, all states require schools to follow a two-step process for identifying students as ELs. First, parents or guardians complete a home-language survey when they enroll their child in a new school district. The survey generally includes one to four questions to identify students whose first language is not English or who live in households where a language other than English is spoken.

If students in such circumstances do not already have scores from a state-approved English language proficiency test on file, they are given a screening test to gauge their English language ability in listening, speaking, reading, and writing (as required by ESSA). Students scoring below proficient are categorized as ELs. Schools must inform parents in a timely manner of their child’s English language proficiency level and of the types of support the school can provide, including the right to opt out of services (but not the right to decline EL status and subsequent annual testing).¹¹

In Michigan, students are screened for initial EL identification using the WIDA ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT) and a state-approved early literacy or reading test. Students are identified as ELs if they score below a designated level on the W-APT and below grade level in reading. Once identified, ELs are given the WIDA ACCESS for

ELLs 2.0 annually until they score highly enough to be reclassified as English proficient. To be reclassified, students must have a composite score of at least 4.5 out of 6.0 on the ACCESS, with a score of at least 4.0 on both the reading and writing subtests, and pass additional reading and writing tests. The state recommends that students in kindergarten through 2nd grade continue to receive EL services until they pass the statewide M-STEP ELA exam by scoring either proficient or advanced, which is given for the first time in third grade. However, districts may use a state-approved reading test and a local writing test to determine whether students in younger grades can exit EL status. Students in grade 3 or higher must get a passing score on the M-STEP ELA or a state-approved local reading test. If using a state-approved local reading test, the district also considers local writing assessments in determining if a student is ready to exit EL services.¹²

B. Accountability for English Language Proficiency

Whereas parents and teachers are primarily interested in the progress of individual students toward English language proficiency, state accountability systems track whether the ELs in entire schools and districts are progressing to and achieving proficiency within the state-determined timeline. States include English language proficiency in their accountability systems in two ways. First, they set a long-term goal for increasing the percent of students making progress toward proficiency (with interim goals along the way), and, second, they include an annual indicator of progress toward English language proficiency in the calculation they use to identify schools in need of improvement.¹³

Michigan students are expected to take a maximum of six years to achieve English language proficiency, with expectations for individual students set based on their initial English proficiency level. Students will be considered on track if they meet their

personalized growth targets from one year to the next. The Michigan ESSA plan describes two methods for calculating these targets: (1) estimating the growth required each year to meet the ultimate target in the expected number of years, and (2) a growth model that compares how a student performed relative to the average performance of students with a similar profile.¹⁴

It is not clear from this plan whether only one or both methods were used to set the state's long-term goals. However, the plan did state that about 46 percent of ELs made enough progress in SY 2015–16 to achieve proficiency within the given timeline. Using this baseline, the state aims to increase the share of ELs making the expected amount of progress by between 1 percent and 2 percent each year, with a goal of reaching 59 percent by SY 2024–25. In line with ESSA guidance, Michigan plans to factor in whether schools are making relatively less progress in moving students toward English proficiency in their criteria for identifying schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement.¹⁵

C. Accountability for EL Academic Achievement

In addition to progress toward English proficiency, ESSA requires states to report and include in their accountability systems data on how well ELs, as a subgroup, are performing on the indicators that apply to all students (including ELA, math, and science tests; graduation rates; and a school-quality or student-success indicator such as attendance). Using this information, ESSA calls for states to identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement based on the performance of all students, including subgroups of students, and for targeted support and improvement for schools that have one or more underperforming subgroups such as ELs.

As noted earlier, the EL subgroup is unique in that students exit the subgroup once they reach a level at which their English proficiency is no longer keeping them from general

academic achievement similar to that of their English-proficient peers. Because of this, ESSA allows states to include former ELs within the EL subgroup for up to four years after they have exited EL status. Former EL students' scores in math and reading can thus be used in accountability measures as a way to give schools credit for the progress those students have made. Michigan will not include former ELs in their calculation of academic achievement and academic progress indicators.¹⁶

Unlike for other subgroups, ESSA also provides two types of exemption states may choose to apply to recently arrived ELs on state standardized tests:

1. In their first year in the United States, ELs can be exempt from taking the ELA test. They must be tested in math that year, but their scores will not be included in accountability calculations. Regular test-taking and accountability procedures will apply thereafter.
2. ELs take ELA and math tests in their first year, but their scores can be excluded from

accountability measures. In the second year, outcomes on both tests are reported as a growth score from year one to year two. From their third year on, students are assessed and their scores included in accountability measures as is done for all students.

States also have a third option: they may assign option 1 to some recently arrived ELs and option 2 to others based on characteristics such as their initial English language proficiency level.¹⁷ Michigan's ESSA plan indicates it will use option 1 for its recently arrived ELs.¹⁸

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 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.¹⁹

Endnotes

- 1 Migration Policy Institute (MPI) Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Language & Education,” accessed April 25, 2018, www.migrationpolicy.org/data/state-profiles/state/language/MI/US/.
- 2 U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), “Table 204.20: English Language Learner (ELL) Students Enrolled in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by State: Selected Years, Fall 2000 through Fall 2015,” updated October 2017, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_204.20.asp?current=yes.
- 3 MPI Data Hub, “State Immigration Data Profiles: Language & Education.”
- 4 Michigan Department of Education (MDE), “MI School Data—Student Count,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/StudentInformation/StudentCounts/StudentCount.aspx
- 5 The ACCESS for ELLs—which stands for Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners—is an English language proficiency assessment given annually to English Learners (ELs) in the 39 states and U.S. territories that make up the WIDA Consortium. For more information on the consortium, see WIDA, “Home,” accessed July 24, 2018, www.wida.us.
- 6 Although the exit criteria changed in Fall 2017, the criteria used in SY 2016-17 called for students to be exited with a composite score of 5 and a minimum score of 4.5 in all four domains (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), along with consideration of their score on the state English language arts test. See, for example, Holland Public Schools, “New LEP Entrance and Exit Criteria (Updated Spring 2015),” accessed July 13, 2018, www.hollandpublicschools.org/downloads/esl/summary_new_entrance_and_exit_criteria.pdf.
- 7 MDE, “Spring 2017 Michigan M-STEP Guide to Reports” (exam guidance, November 7, 2017), www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/2017_M-STEP_GTR_598970_7.pdf.
- 8 MDE, “MI School Data—High School Assessments—Proficiency,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/AssessmentResults/AssessmentHighSchoolProficiency.aspx; MDE, “Michigan Merit Examination,” accessed July 13, 2018, www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-22709_35150---,00.html.
- 9 MDE, “MI School Data—Grad/Dropout Rate—2016–17,” accessed July 5, 2018, www.mischooldata.org/DistrictSchoolProfiles2/StudentInformation/GraduationDropoutRate2.aspx.
- 10 NCES, “Table 219.46. Public High School 4-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (ACGR), by Selected Student Characteristics and State: 2010-11 through 2015-16,” updated December 2017, https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_219.46.asp?current=yes.
- 11 U.S. Department of Education, *Tools and Resources for Identifying all English Learners* (Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2016), www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/english-learner-toolkit/chap1.pdf.
- 12 MDE, *Entrance and Exit Protocol, English Learner Program* (Lansing, MI: MDE, 2017), www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Entrance_and_Exit_Protocol_updated_May_2016_550634_7.pdf.
- 13 Susan Lyons and Nathan Dadey, *Considering English Language Proficiency within Systems of Educational Accountability under the Every Student Succeeds Act* (Chicago: Latino Policy Forum and Center for Assessment, 2017), www.latinopolicyforum.org/publications/reports/document/Considerations-for-ELP-indicator-in-ESSA_030817.pdf.
- 14 Both of these methods provide useful information; however, it is not clear how the state intends to combine them into a single calculation. Method 1 sets predetermined targets for each student that indicate whether enough progress is being made each year to meet an end goal. Method 2 indicates whether each student improved his or her score more or less than the average of his or her peers, but it cannot be assumed that this average represents sufficient growth each year to meet the end goal. For a detailed explanation of how these two methods may be used independently as English language proficiency indicators, see Oregon Department of Education, *Oregon’s Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act* (Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education, 2017), www.oregon.gov/ode/rules-and-policies/ESSA/Documents/APPROVED%20OR_ConsolidatedStateplan8-30-17.pdf.
- 15 MDE, *Michigan’s Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act* (Lansing, MI: MDE, 2017), www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Michigan-ESSA-Plan_11-15-17_606136_7.pdf.

- 16 Ibid.
- 17 EdTrust, “Setting New Accountability for English-Learner Outcomes in ESSA Plans,” accessed April 26, 2018, <https://edtrust.org/setting-new-accountability-english-learner-outcomes-essa-plans/>.
- 18 MDE, *Michigan’s Consolidated State Plan*.
- 19 For additional information on accessing and understanding state EL demographic and outcome data, see Julie Sugarman, *A Guide to Finding and Understanding English Learner Data* (Washington, DC: MPI, 2018), www.migrationpolicy.org/research/guide-finding-understanding-english-learner-data.

About the Authors



Julie Sugarman is a Senior 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.



Courtney Geary was an intern at the MPI National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, where she provided research assistance on a variety of projects related to English Learner education policy. She has worked as a Title III ESL Tutor for the Tuscaloosa County School District in Alabama since 2016, primarily with elementary-age Arabic speakers. Her research interests include educational access and outcomes for English Learners in the Deep South, and educational and social services for refugees and victims of conflict. She is a student at the University of Alabama, where she is pursuing a B.S. in interdisciplinary studies

with a focus in international crisis management.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank former Migration Policy Institute (MPI) interns Kevin Lee and Abby Scott for their research assistance, and colleagues Jie Zong and Jeanne Batalova for their compilation of the U.S. Census Bureau data used throughout this fact sheet. They also gratefully acknowledge the support of colleagues Leslie Villegas, Lauren Shaw, Margie McHugh, Delia Pompa, and Michelle Mittelstadt.

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 for this series of fact sheets was provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Walton Family Foundation supported an earlier project upon which this series builds.

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

© 2018 Migration Policy Institute.
All Rights Reserved.

Cover Design: April Siruno, MPI
Layout: Sara Staedicke, 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 publication can be found at www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy.
Inquiries can also be directed to communications@migrationpolicy.org.

Suggested citation: Sugarman, Julie and Courtney Geary. 2018. *English Learners in Michigan: Demographics, Outcomes, and State Accountability Policies*. 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/INTEGRATION

