

DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS AT THE ONE-YEAR MARK

A Profile of Currently Eligible Youth and Applicants

By Jeanne Batalova, Sarah Hooker, and Randy Capps
with James D. Bachmeier and Erin Cox

THE ISSUE: August 2013 marks the one-year anniversary of the implementation of the Obama administration's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which took effect on August 15, 2012. The DACA initiative offers a two-year reprieve from deportation as well as work authorization for eligible unauthorized immigrants who entered the United States before the age of 16; meet length of residence, education, and other requirements; and were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012.

Eligibility for DACA is tied to human capital, as applicants must be enrolled in school or have earned at least a high school diploma or its equivalent. This issue brief examines eligibility, particularly from an educational attainment perspective, as well as the variety of barriers to re-enrolling in education or training and qualifying for DACA faced by some members of the unauthorized youth population.

I. Introduction

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) initiative announced by the Obama administration on June 15, 2012 and implemented on August 15, 2012 grants eligible immigrant youth work authorization and temporary relief from deportation. DACA youth can also obtain driver's licenses in almost all states, and in some they pay in-state tuition rates in public colleges and universities. According to the latest Migration Policy Institute (MPI) estimates, up to 1.9 million unauthorized youth are potentially eligible for DACA (see Appendix for methodology).

DACA is based on the executive branch's authority to administer immigration laws and represents an exercise of prosecutorial discretion to defer deportation of individuals in the country illegally who are deemed to be low enforcement priorities.

Under the guidelines unveiled by US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), unauthorized youth are eligible for DACA if they:

- are between the ages of 15 and 30 (as of June 15, 2012);

- came to the United States before the age of 16;
- were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012;
- have lived in the United States continuously for at least five years (i.e., since June 15, 2007);
- are currently in school,¹ have graduated from high school or earned a General Equivalency Diploma (GED), or are honorably discharged veterans of the US armed forces or Coast Guard; and
- have not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, or three or more misdemeanors; and do not otherwise pose a threat to public safety or national security.

DACA is granted for a two-year period, and can be renewed for an additional two years. Individuals can also apply for DACA once they are in the custody of immigration authorities, as a defense against their deportation.

The one-year anniversary of the DACA policy's implementation offers a timely moment to review the characteristics of youth who have applied for relief, reflect on the policy's success in reaching the target population, and consider barriers that may prevent some unauthorized youth from taking advantage of this initiative.

This review is also timely as Congress considers legislation that would provide opportunities for some unauthorized immigrants to adjust their legal status. The *Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act* passed by the Senate in June 2013 includes an expedited route to lawful permanent resident (LPR) status and citizenship for those who were brought to the United States at a young age, through legislation known as the *Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act*. The House may also introduce legislation provid-

ing a path to LPR status and citizenship for the DREAM population, which has characteristics similar to the youth who are eligible for DACA.

This issue brief draws on two data sources to assess the number and key characteristics of the DACA population: (1) published USCIS information on DACA applicants and (2) MPI's estimates of the DACA-eligible population. These estimates are drawn from the Census Bureau's 2011 American Community Survey (ACS) — the most recent large nationally representative survey — with immigration status assigned based on responses to another national survey: the 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Unauthorized immigrants are differentiated from legal immigrants based on answers to a SIPP question about whether noncitizens have a green card (i.e., have LPR status). Using self-reported data about LPR status allows us to generate a new, more refined portrait of the DACA population than has been available in the past.²

We start by enumerating unauthorized youth who are or may in the future be eligible for the DACA initiative. We distinguish among three groups: 1) currently eligible youth who meet the age, age-at-arrival, and education requirements; 2) youth who meet the age and age-at-arrival requirements, but appear, based on analysis of the ACS data, not to meet the education requirements; and 3) children under 15 who will be eligible in the future provided that they meet the education requirements.³ Next, we compare the top states of residence and origin countries of DACA applicants to those of the currently eligible population. We then describe additional sociodemographic and economic characteristics of the currently eligible population. Finally, we present brief profiles of the two groups who currently cannot apply for DACA because they do not meet the education requirements or are too young, and we highlight the barriers these groups might face in meeting DACA's eligibility requirements.

II. The Potentially Eligible DACA Population


We estimate that there are 1.9 million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States who are under the age of 31, arrived in the United States before June 2007, and were under age 16 at arrival.⁴ Within this population, we estimate that approximately 57 percent (1.09 million) currently meet DACA's age and educational eligibility criteria (i.e., are ages 15 to 30 and are either enrolled in school or have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent) (see Figure 1).

Twenty-two percent (423,000) of the potentially eligible population meets the age requirements

but appear not to meet the education criteria because they do not have a high school degree or equivalent and are not enrolled in school. Unauthorized youth in this group may become eligible if they enroll in an education, literacy, or career training program leading to a GED or placement in postsecondary education, job training, or employment. Some number of these youth may have enrolled in such a program since the data used in our estimates were collected in 2011, and the definitions of school enrollment may differ between the DACA requirements and the self-reported data in the ACS.

Twenty-one percent (392,000) are children under age 15 who could become eligible once they reach age 15, if they stay in school or obtain a high school degree or equivalent.⁵

Figure 1. Unauthorized Population Potentially Eligible for DACA



Notes: Percentages shown are based on an estimated total of 1,904,000 unauthorized immigrant youth who arrived in the United States before June 2007, were under the age of 16 at arrival, and are under the age of 31. *Currently eligible youth* meet both age and education criteria (i.e., they are ages 15 to 30 and are either enrolled in school or have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent). *Youth who do not meet education criteria* are those ages 15 to 30 who do not have a high school diploma or equivalent and are not enrolled in school. *Children eligible in the future* meet the age-at-arrival requirements but are not yet 15 years old, and will age into eligibility provided they stay in school.

Source: MPI analysis of data from 2011 American Community Survey (ACS) and the 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of The Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute (PRI). See Appendix for more information about the data.

III. Comparing DACA Applicants and the Currently Eligible Population

USCIS reported that it accepted for processing more than half a million (537,662) complete DACA applications between August 2012 and June 30, 2013.⁶ Nearly 75 percent (400,562) were approved, and 1 percent (5,383) denied, with the remainder awaiting a decision.⁷ Based on the current approval rate, it can be anticipated that the vast majority of pending applications will be approved, although the approval rate may fall somewhat as the caseload could include applications that have been pending for some time because they are more difficult to adjudicate.

Our estimates of the currently eligible population represent one frame of reference for considering the scope of DACA uptake and how the characteristics of applicants compare to those of the larger eligible population. USCIS publishes information on applicants' states of residence and their predominant countries of origin, allowing for comparison to the currently eligible population.

Based on MPI and USCIS data, we estimate that the application rate is 49 percent nationwide (see Table 1). The application rates in Table 1 are based on the ratio of applications accepted for processing to the *currently eligible population* (ages 15 to 30). A second way to calculate the application rate would be to compare the number of applications accepted for processing to the population of *potential* beneficiaries ages 15 to 30 — including those who do not yet meet education requirements but could meet these requirements if they enroll in an adult education, literacy, or training program. Taking this approach, the nationwide application rate is 36 percent.

There are several reasons why youth might not have applied for DACA. Those who do not have a high school diploma may face difficulties accessing adult education and other qualifying education programs. Among those who

have the requisite education, some youth may have difficulty paying application or legal fees or documenting their presence in the United States, while others may have concerns about criminal offenses and other factors that could disqualify them. Additionally, youth may fear that revealing their own or their family members' unauthorized status could lead to deportation. Since DACA allows youth to apply defensively after being taken into immigration custody, some may choose to wait until this happens. Finally, some youth may be waiting to see if immigration reform legislation is enacted and offers them a more secure path to legal status.

A. State of Residence

The traditional immigrant-destination states — chiefly California, Texas, New York, and Florida — are home to the largest numbers of potential DACA beneficiaries, as well as the largest numbers of applicants. Together, California and Texas account for 44 percent of all currently eligible youth, and 45 percent of all applications accepted for processing. Because these states account for such large shares of applicants and eligible youth, the application rates in California and Texas drive the national rate (see Table 1).

Application rates in New York (34 percent) and Florida (35 percent) — the other top states of residence of currently eligible youth — are substantially lower than the national rate. At the same time, application rates in North Carolina (74 percent), Georgia (63 percent), and Illinois (60 percent) are higher than the national rate. Potential explanations for state variation in application rates could include: differences in immigrant youths' workforce participation and the relative importance of obtaining work authorization, public transportation options and the relative urgency of obtaining a driver's license, the climate of reception for immigrants, and availability and cost of legal assistance to navigate the application process.

Table 1. Top Ten States of Residence of Currently Eligible DACA Youth and DACA Applications Accepted for Processing

State of Residence	Currently Eligible Population	Share of All Currently Eligible Youth (%)	Applications Accepted for Processing	Application Rate (%)
Total	1,089,000	100	538,000	49
California	311,000	29	153,000	49
Texas	165,000	15	88,000	54
New York	86,000	8	29,000	34
Florida	65,000	6	23,000	35
Illinois	49,000	4	30,000	60
Arizona	33,000	3	19,000	58
Georgia	28,000	3	18,000	63
New Jersey	36,000	3	16,000	43
North Carolina	26,000	2	19,000	74
Washington	25,000	2	11,000	45

Notes: Currently eligible youth meet both age and education criteria (i.e., they are ages 15 to 30 and are either enrolled in school or have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent); this group does not include those potential beneficiaries who may become eligible by enrolling in an adult education, literacy, or training program. The data do not account for youth who have enrolled in such a program since the ACS data were collected in 2011. *Application rate* refers to the ratio of applications accepted for processing to the currently eligible population. We limit our analysis to the ten states with the largest currently eligible populations because sample sizes for other states are too small to generate reliable estimates.

Source: US Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS), “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals” data for August 2012 – June 30, 2013, www.uscis.gov/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca-13-7-12.pdf; MPI analysis of Bachmeier and Van Hook data from 2011 ACS and 2008 SIPP.

Using the alternative application rate (including potential beneficiaries ages 15 to 30 who do not currently appear to meet education criteria in the denominator), state variation follows a similar pattern, with rates lower for New York and Florida (26 percent each), and higher for North Carolina (50 percent).

B. Country of Origin

There are also variations in DACA application rates among national-origin groups: 59 percent (or 637,000) of the 1.09 million currently eligible youth are Mexican (see Table 2). Mexicans also have the highest DACA

application rate, with nearly two-thirds of those eligible (64 percent) having applied as of June 30, 2013. Youth from Honduras also have an above-average application rate (58 percent), while those from El Salvador and Guatemala have application rates closer to the rate for all origin groups (45 percent and 47 percent respectively). Together, individuals from Mexico, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras account for 68 percent of the currently eligible population, but 85 percent of those who have already applied.

DACA-eligible youth from other origin countries have much lower application rates. Youth from the Philippines and the Dominican Republic appear to have particularly low

application rates: 16 percent and 14 percent, respectively. Chinese youth are notably absent: although China ranks ninth among the countries of origin of the currently eligible population, it was not among the top 20 for DACA applicants in the program’s first year.⁸

As shown in Table 1, states with greater ethnic diversity and a lower concentration of Mexican and Central American immigrants — including

New York and Florida — have lower application rates.

When using the alternative application rate that also encompasses the cohort that does not currently appear to meet the education requirements, a similar pattern applies: Mexico and the Central American countries have above-average application rates, while Philippines and the Dominican Republic have relatively low rates.

Table 2. Top Eight Countries of Origin of Currently Eligible DACA Youth and DACA Applications Accepted for Processing

Origin Country	Currently Eligible Population	Share of All Currently Eligible Youth (%)	Applications Accepted for Processing	Application Rate (%)
Total	1,089,000	100	538,000	49
Mexico	637,000	59	409,000	64
El Salvador	47,000	4	21,000	45
Guatemala	29,000	3	13,000	47
Honduras	24,000	2	14,000	58
Korea	22,000	2	7,000	33
Philippines	22,000	2	4,000	16
Colombia	19,000	2	5,000	28
Dominican Republic	17,000	2	2,000	14

Notes: *Currently eligible youth* meet both age and education criteria (i.e., they are ages 15 to 30 and are either enrolled in school or have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent); this group does not include those potential beneficiaries who may become eligible by enrolling in an adult education, literacy, or training program. *Application rate* refers to the ratio of applications accepted for processing to the currently eligible population. The data do not account for youth who have enrolled in such a program since the ACS data were collected in 2011. We limit our analysis to the eight countries for which USCIS released application data and for which we have sufficient sample sizes to generate reliable estimates.
Source: USCIS, “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals,” 2012-2013 data; and MPI analysis of Bachmeier and Van Hook data from 2011 ACS and 2008 SIPP.

IV. Additional Characteristics of the Currently Eligible Population

While USCIS does not publish data on additional characteristics of DACA applicants, MPI’s estimates provide a more detailed profile of the

currently eligible population, allowing greater insight into the barriers that different groups of unauthorized youth face as they apply or consider applying for DACA.

A. Educational Attainment

Of the 1.09 million currently eligible youth, we estimate that 266,000 (or 24 percent) are enrolled in K-12 education — in the high school grades, in most cases (see Table 3). An additional 482,000 (44 percent) have earned a high school diploma or its equivalent, but have not obtained a college degree and are not currently enrolled in college. About 10 percent have completed an associate degree or higher, and an additional 22 percent are enrolled in college.

Under the comprehensive immigration reform legislation passed by the Senate in June 2013, unauthorized youth who came to the United States before age 16 would need to complete at least two years of postsecondary education or serve in the military in order to be eligible to receive LPR status through the DREAM Act. Thus, a significant share of the DACA population would need further education in order to qualify for the DREAM pathway in the Senate legislation.

Table 3. School Enrollment and Educational Attainment of Currently Eligible DACA Youth

Educational Attainment	Currently Eligible Population	Share (%)
Total	1,089,000	100
Currently enrolled in grades K-12	266,000	24
High school diploma/GED as terminal degree	482,000	44
Currently enrolled in college (no degree)	240,000	22
Associate degree	40,000	4
Bachelor's degree	53,000	5
Advanced degree	8,000	1


Notes: *Currently eligible youth* meet both age and education criteria (i.e., they are ages 15 to 30 and are either enrolled in school or have at least a high school diploma or its equivalent); this group does not include those potential beneficiaries who may become eligible by enrolling in an adult education, literacy, or training program. The data do not account for youth who have enrolled in such a program since the ACS data were collected in 2011.
Source: MPI analysis of Bachmeier and Van Hook data from 2011 ACS and 2008 SIPP.

B. English Proficiency

Most currently eligible youth have strong English language skills, reflecting their long-term residence and schooling in the United States. We estimate that 60 percent are bilingual, speaking English very well and also speaking

another home language, and 9 percent speak only English (see Figure 2). The remaining 31 percent are Limited English Proficient (LEP, or speak English less than very well), including 10 percent who reported speaking English not well or not at all.

Figure 2. English Proficiency of Currently Eligible DACA Youth



Notes: Currently eligible youth meet both age and education criteria; this group does not include those potential beneficiaries who may become eligible by enrolling in an adult education, literacy, or training program. The data do not account for youth who have enrolled in such a program since the ACS data were collected in 2011. The *bilingual* population includes those who report speaking English very well and who also speak another language at home. The *Limited English Proficient (LEP)* population includes those who speak a language other than English at home and who speak English less than very well.


Source: MPI analysis of Bachmeier and Van Hook data from 2011 ACS and 2008 SIPP.

C. Poverty Status

We estimate that more than one-third (35 percent) of currently eligible DACA youth lives in families with incomes below 100 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL), and two-thirds (66 percent) live in families with incomes below 200 percent of FPL (see Figure 3).⁹ Poverty can

serve as both a barrier and a motivating factor in terms of the decision to apply for DACA. Individuals living in poverty have much to gain from the program, as approval for DACA would allow them to obtain lawful employment. The \$465 application fee, however, may be an obstacle for the lowest-income individuals.

Figure 3. Family Income as a Share of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) for Currently Eligible DACA Youth



Notes: Currently eligible youth meet both age and education criteria; this group does not include those potential beneficiaries who may become eligible by enrolling in an adult education, literacy, or training program. The data do not account for youth who have enrolled in such a program since the ACS data were collected in 2011.

Source: MPI analysis of Bachmeier and Van Hook data from 2011 ACS and 2008 SIPP.

D. Age, Gender, Labor Force Participation, and Parental Status

A large majority (68 percent) of the 1.09 million currently eligible population is 18 to 26 years old — the prime age for either entering the workforce or attending college. Males outnumber females among this cohort, comprising 55 percent of those who meet DACA's age and education requirements.

In many cases, DACA-eligible youth already contribute to household income through paid work. A majority (55 percent) of those currently eligible are in the labor force. Parents with children living in the home comprise 11 percent of DACA-eligible youth.

V. Characteristics of Youth Who Currently Do Not Appear to Meet Education Criteria

As mentioned earlier, there are approximately 423,000 individuals who are ages 15-30 and meet DACA's age at arrival and length of residency criteria, but do not appear to meet the program's education requirements because they do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent and are not enrolled in school. These young adults could apply for DACA if they return to high school (for those who are still in the appropriate age range), or enroll in a qualifying adult education or career training program leading to a GED or high school diploma, or leading to placement in postsecondary education, job training, or employment.¹⁰

MPI's estimates suggest that this population faces several barriers to meeting DACA's requirements. In addition to lower educational attainment, these youth have lower English proficiency and lower incomes than their currently eligible peers. Such youth are also more likely to have work and parenting responsibilities that may affect their ability to enroll and stay in education or training.

In terms of their educational attainment, 58 percent have completed some high school but lack a diploma, while 42 percent have not completed any high school grades. Over two-thirds (69 percent) are LEP, compared to 31 percent of the currently eligible population. These findings suggest a substantial need for adult education, English as a Second Language (ESL) courses, and training programs that are linked to career pathways or higher education.

Forty-two percent of those who do not appear to meet DACA's education criteria based on analysis of the ACS data live in families with incomes below 100 percent of FPL, and three-quarters (77 percent) live in families with incomes below 200 percent of FPL. The cost of tuition and fees for education and training programs is likely to be a particularly significant factor in these individuals' ability to further their education. In some states, publicly funded adult education programs are free or low-cost and are open to all residents regardless of immigration status; in other states, however, unauthorized immigrants must pay higher tuition rates or are barred altogether from enrolling in these programs.¹¹

Youth who appear not to meet DACA's education requirements have a relatively high rate of workforce participation: 71 percent are in the labor force, compared to 55 percent of currently eligible youth. This group faces the challenge of finding classes that do not conflict with work schedules, as giving up work hours to pursue education may not be an option for those in low-income families. This population is also predominately male (64 percent); many of these young men may have migrated to the United States at a young age to enter the workforce and serve as breadwinners for their families.

Finally, youth who currently do not appear to meet the education criteria are also more likely to be parents than their peers who have the required education. Thirty-one percent are parents with children living in the same household, compared to 11 percent of currently eligible youth. Access to affordable and reliable child care will play an important role in their ability to pursue education and apply for DACA. The educational success of this group holds critical implications for their children — the vast majority of whom are US citizens — as parents' educational attainment is a strong predictor of children's future outcomes.¹²

VI. Characteristics of Children Eligible in the Future

Finally, there are 392,000 children under age 15 who meet DACA's length of residence criteria and could be eligible for relief in the future, as the program currently has no expiration date for initial applications. Almost half (49 percent) of this younger population is ages 12 to 14, meaning they could soon age into DACA eligibility. Most of these children are currently in school in the United States, as public education is free and compulsory in all states until at least age 16. However, these children will need to remain in school — and eventually complete at least a high school diploma — in order to achieve DACA eligibility.

Some children in this group face unique barriers to high school completion. Twenty-seven percent have limited English proficiency. While many of these students will transition to full English proficiency by the late elementary grades, some will likely remain in English language learner (ELL) programs at the high school level. In nearly all states, ELL graduation rates substantially lag rates for all students. The majority of future DACA beneficiaries are Hispanic — and Hispanic graduation rates also remain below those of non-Hispanic whites.¹³

Finally, most children in the future-eligible group live in low-income families. Over half (57 percent) have family incomes below FPL, and 84 percent have family incomes below 200 percent of FPL. A wide body of research demonstrates a negative relationship between poverty and academic success across all levels of education.¹⁴ Access to social services and financial support, along with effective instructional programs to help ELLs master English, are likely to play a critical role in helping this young population stay in school and qualify for DACA in the future.

VI. Conclusion

In sum, one year into its implementation, the DACA program has reached about half of the unauthorized immigrant youth we estimate are now eligible to enroll. As mentioned earlier, this brief's primary focus is on the unauthorized youth population that currently meets DACA's age, age-at-arrival, and education requirements. This group's application rate, through June 30, 2013, is 49 percent. For the broader group of potential beneficiaries ages 15 to 30 — including those who do not appear to meet education requirements but could if they enroll in an adult education, literacy, or training program — the application rate is 36 percent.

Program uptake appears especially strong among Mexican and Central American unauthorized youth, and there is substantial variation in take-up across the states. But we know little else about the characteristics of applicants, since USCIS has not released any other data on their characteristics. It may be that eligible youth with more formal schooling are more likely to apply than those who are less educated, or that application fees deter low-income youth from applying. Collecting data beyond what USCIS can provide may be necessary to answer questions about why the other half of the DACA-eligible population has not yet applied.

Our DACA population estimates provide some insights into the barriers for the youth who

do not appear to meet the program's education criteria. These youth have more limited English skills, lower incomes, a higher rate of workforce participation, and a greater likelihood of having children in the home. All these factors may create substantial barriers to participation in adult education or career training, preventing this group of unauthorized youth from meeting the DACA requirements — and leaving them in unauthorized status absent any changes in US immigration policy. Expanding the availability of adult education, literacy, and workforce programs shown to be effective with such youth would be key to maximizing DACA participation.

There is also a substantial group of children who could become eligible for DACA in the future. These children have a high poverty rate, and many are English language learners — both of which are risk factors for dropping out of school. But DACA may provide motivation for unauthorized youth to graduate, if this incentive is effectively communicated to students and if school systems provide the necessary support these youth need to stay in school.

Finally, DACA's overall impact on the postsecondary choices of unauthorized youth remains to be seen. The program expands opportunities to work in the formal sector, where jobs are better-paying and where education is more highly rewarded than in the informal jobs which many unauthorized workers hold. DACA recipients also have been granted access to driver's licenses by all states except Arizona and lower college tuition by some states, opening the door to a wider range of jobs and educational opportunities. For some youth, immediate financial needs will likely tip the scale in favor of leaving school to pursue employment, while others may find that DACA provides the motivation to enroll in higher education and complete a degree. Either way, DACA is likely to substantially increase the economic mobility of a sizeable number of immigrant youth: more than 400,000 on the program's first anniversary.

Appendix: Data and Methodology

In August 2012, the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) released a profile of the total population that could be eligible to take advantage of DACA.¹⁵ We found that overall about 1.76 million unauthorized youth could potentially benefit from the DACA initiative. The analysis was based on US Census Bureau pooled 2006-08 Current Population Survey (CPS) data with assignments of legal status to noncitizens by Jeffrey S. Passel of the Pew Hispanic Center, and updated with the pooled 2008-10 CPS data. Our current analysis indicates that about 1.9 million youth could apply for DACA, if not immediately then as they meet education and other criteria.

It is important to stress that our current analysis relies on a new methodology of assigning legal status to noncitizens. This methodology, developed by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of The Pennsylvania State University, uses answers about respondents' lawful permanent residency status (otherwise known as a green card) in the Census Bureau's national 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and carries them forward to produce estimates from the 2011 American Community Survey (ACS), the Census Bureau's most recent population survey of about 3.5 million households. Thus, the differences in the overall numbers and characteristics of the potential DACA beneficiary population in two MPI fact sheets could be attributed not only to the trends in unauthorized immigrant flows in the last few years but also to differences in methodologies, years of analysis (2008-10 versus 2011), and datasets (CPS versus ACS) used in producing the estimates. The newer methodology has advantages in that it relies on self-reported legal status based on the SIPP data and that it uses the ACS' relatively large sample to generate more reliable estimates for small populations.

For a more detailed explanation of our SIPP-ACS based methodology, see Randy Capps, James D. Bachmeier, Michael Fix, and Jennifer Van Hook, *A Demographic, Socioeconomic, and Health Care Profile of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States*, Appendix (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute, 2013), www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/CIRbrief-Profile-Unauthorized.pdf.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for its generous support of this report, as well as the broader scope of work by the Migration Policy Institute's National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy. The authors thank Michael Fix and Margie McHugh of MPI for their guidance and advice in drafting the report, as well as Jennifer Van Hook of the Population Research Institute at The Pennsylvania State University for her direction in developing the methodology for assigning legal status to noncitizens in the data.

About the Authors



Jeanne Batalova is a Senior Policy Analyst at the Migration Policy Institute (MPI). Her areas of expertise include the impacts of immigrants on society and labor markets; social and economic mobility of first- and second-generation youth and young adults; and the policies and practices regulating immigration and integration of highly skilled workers and foreign students in the United States and other countries.

She earned her PhD in sociology, with a specialization in demography, from the University of California-Irvine; an MBA from Roosevelt University; and a bachelor of the arts in economics from the Academy of Economic Studies, Chisinau, Moldova.



Sarah Hooker is a Policy Analyst at MPI's National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, where she focuses on research and policy analysis related to education, workforce development, and language acquisition. She manages MPI's field-based research on efforts to promote the high school completion, postsecondary success, and economic advancement of English Language Learners (ELLs) and immigrant youth.

Ms. Hooker holds a master's degree from the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration. She earned a bachelor of the arts degree in Latin American studies from Pomona College in Claremont, CA.



Randy Capps is a demographer and Senior Policy Analyst with MPI's National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy. His areas of expertise include immigration trends, the unauthorized population, immigrants in the US labor force, and children of immigrants.

Prior to joining MPI, Dr. Capps was a researcher in the Immigration Studies Program at the Urban Institute (1993-96 and 2000-08).

Dr. Capps received his PhD in sociology from the University of Texas in 1999 and his master of public affairs degree, also from the University of Texas, in 1992.



James D. Bachmeier is a Research Associate in the Population Research Institute at The Pennsylvania State University. His research focuses on Mexican migration to the United States and the incorporation of the US Mexican-origin population. He has been published in journals such as *Social Forces*, *Social Science Research*, and *International Migration Review*.



Erin Cox is a Research Intern for MPI, where she works with the National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy and the US Immigration Policy program. She is a Master of Public Policy candidate concentrating in immigration policy at the Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration at the George Washington University. Her previous work has included research into recertification processes for professionally trained refugees, and college access and educational attainment of unauthorized immigrant youth.

For more MPI research that focuses on key aspects
of the immigration reform debate, visit:
www.migrationpolicy.org/cir

Endnotes

- 1 For more information, see US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), “Frequently Asked Questions,” www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.eb1d4c2a3e5b9ac89243c6a7543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=3a4dbc4b04499310VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=3a4dbc4b04499310VgnVCM100000082ca60aRCRD#education.
- 2 For further details on the data used in this brief, see the Appendix on data and methodology.
- 3 We do not model the number of unauthorized immigrant youth who might qualify for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program based on military service alone; we believe this number will be very small given that military service in most cases requires legal status. We also do not model how many potential DACA beneficiaries might not satisfy the criminal background requirement, given the lack of authoritative data on criminal violations in this population.
- 4 Our estimate of 1.9 million potentially eligible DACA youth is an increase from our previous August 2012 estimate of 1.76 million; our current estimate relies on a new methodology as described in the introduction to this brief and the Appendix.
- 5 At the time of this writing, there is no expiration date for individuals to apply for DACA.
- 6 USCIS, “Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals,” data for August 2012 – June 30, 2013, www.uscis.gov/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/Immigration%20Forms%20Data/All%20Form%20Types/DACA/daca-13-7-12.pdf.
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 At the time of this writing, USCIS has reported data on the top 20 origin countries of DACA applicants.
- 9 The federal poverty level for a family of four was \$23,021 in 2011. See US Census Bureau, “Poverty Thresholds by Size of Family and Number of Children,” www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/data/threshld/thresh11.xls.
- 10 USCIS, “Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Process,” www.uscis.gov/childhoodarrivals.
- 11 In Florida, for instance, unauthorized immigrants are required to pay a higher tuition rate for adult education classes (Florida Department of Education, “Adult General Education – Questions and Answers on 2011 Florida Statutory Changes,” 2011, www.fldoe.org/workforce/pdf/AGE-statutorychanges-qa.pdf). In both Arizona and Georgia, proof of legal residency is required to participate in adult education programs; State of Arizona Department of Education, “Implementation of Proposition 300 With Regard to Adult Education Services,” April 11, 2007, www.azed.gov/wp-content/uploads/PDF/Proposition-300PolicyMemo.pdf; House Bill 2, State of Georgia, 150th Legislature, May 11, 2009, www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20092010/96748.pdf.
- 12 Pamela Davis-Kean, “The Influence of Parent Education and Family Income on Child Achievement,” *Journal of Family Psychology*, 19 (2005): 294-304, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15982107; Greg Duncan, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and Pamela Klebanov, “Economic Deprivation and Early Childhood Development,” *Child Development* 65 (1994): 296-318, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7516849.

- 13 US Department of Education, "SY2010-11 Four-Year Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates," www2.ed.gov/documents/press-releases/state-2010-11-graduation-rate-data.pdf.
- 14 Greg Duncan and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, eds., *Consequences of Growing Up Poor* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997).
- 15 Jeanne Batalova and Michelle Mittelstadt, *Relief from Deportation: Demographic Profile of the DREAMers Potentially Eligible under the Deferred Action Policy* (Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. 2012), www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/FS24_deferredaction.pdf.

© 2013 Migration Policy Institute. All Rights Reserved.
Design: April Siruno, MPI
Typesetting: Rebecca Kilberg, 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/copy.php. Inquiries can also be directed to: Permissions Department, Migration Policy Institute, 1400 16th Street, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC 20036, or by contacting communications@migrationpolicy.org.

Suggested citation: Batalova, Jeanne, Sarah Hooker, and Randy Capps with James D. Bachmeier and Erin Cox. 2013. *Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals at the One-Year Mark: A Profile of Currently Eligible Youth and Applicants*. 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/CIR

About MPI's United States Immigration Policy Program

With the politics and policy issues of immigration more complex and contentious than ever, it is vitally important that policymakers and the American public have solid information, fact-based analysis, and sound policy ideas on which to base their discussions, and, ultimately, their decisions. Through its US Immigration Policy Program, MPI is providing careful analysis of existing policies and articulating a series of pragmatic, workable policy proposals to overhaul an outdated US immigration system so it can better reflect current realities and needs for US society, employers, communities, and native-born and immigrant residents alike.