



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Evanston/Skokie District 65 Board of Education

**CC:** Dr. Paul Goren, Superintendent of Schools;  
Peter Godard, Chief Officer, Research,  
Accountability, & Data

**FROM:** Lora Taira, Director, Research, Accountability,  
and Data

**DATE:** November 14, 2016

**RE:** Enrollment Projections

---

Objective:    \_\_\_ Information      X   Discussion    \_\_\_ Follow-up    \_\_\_ Decision

### Background

Each year, District 65 prepares five-year enrollment projections by grade and school, and for the District. Enrollment projections are used to estimate staffing needs, space usage, revenues and expenditures, transportation needs, and more.

Projections are based on and project to September 30 enrollments, the date the Illinois State Board of Education uses for the official fall enrollment counts. The District's enrollment projections are calculated using a straight-line projection methodology. Using this model, the numbers of students at each grade level are rolled forward to the next grade and fifth graders are assigned to their feeder middle schools. Kindergarten enrollments are estimated using a five-year rolling average. Projections are created for schools and then totaled for the district.

Typically, an error rate of two percent for projecting district enrollments one year into the future, and an error rate of five to six percent for projecting enrollments five years into the future is considered acceptable. The further into the future projections are made, the higher the error rate tends to be. It is also more difficult to project by school and grade with a high degree of accuracy. School districts aim for error rates of four percent or less for individual grade levels. However, kindergarten projections often have larger error rates.

Factors that influence enrollments include past births in the district area, residential construction and demolition, families moving in and out of existing homes, families opting for private schools or homeschooling, and changes in the economy that impact the number of families doubling up. Projections by school are also impacted by changes in the number of limited school choice applications received and changes to where special education and bilingual education services are provided. In prior years, projections were also impacted by the Public School Choice option imposed by the No Child Left Behind Act.

### Findings

#### *Accuracy Rate of Previous One-Year Projections*

Tables 1 and 2 show the error rate for one-year projections at the district, school, and grade level. Error rates greater than four percent are circled. The 2016-17 error rates for the district and all grade levels except for fifth grade are all within four percent. There were five schools with larger discrepancies between projected and actual enrollments: Dawes, Dewey, Lincolnwood, Oakton, and Walker.

For the 2016-17 school year, 7456 students were projected and 7559 students enrolled; a difference of 103 students. The error rate was -1.4 percent. There were 830 kindergarteners projected and the actual enrollment was 815; a difference of 15 students; an error rate of 1.8 percent.

#### *Five-Year Enrollment Projections*

Table 3 shows the district level projections for 2017-18 through 2021-22. The projections predict a decline in district enrollments, with the largest decrease in 2021-22. Table 4 shows the projections for each school. It should be noted that enrollment projections do not account for full enrollment at the magnet schools and assume consistency in special education and bilingual programs as well as the same level of interest in limited school choice options.

The schools with projected increases in enrollments from 2016-17 to 2021-22 are Nichols (+67), Dewey (+44), Oakton (+44), Haven (+34), and Orrington (+30). The remaining schools have projected decreases in enrollments with the largest decreases at Kingsley (-77), Lincolnwood (-49), Willard (-45), and Chute (-45).

As noted above, the factors influencing enrollment are varied and complex and longer-term projections are less reliable than short-term projections. District 65 enrollment in neighborhood and magnet schools increased 750 students or 11.0 percent between school year 2011-12 and school year 2016-17. Projections presented to the Board in November 2011 projected a smaller increase of 224 students or 3.3 percent. As with this historical projection, the accuracy of the predictions presented in Tables 3 and 4 will depend on the stability of current trends in housing markets and birth rates.

#### *Managing Enrollments for Bilingual Compliance*

Based on an onsite bilingual monitoring review in April 2014, the district was cited for non-compliance due to the Two-way Immersion (TWI) class sizes being too large in comparison to the general education classrooms. This finding relates to the following statute.

*The student-teacher ratio in the ESL and home language components of programs serving students in kindergarten or any of grades 1 through 12 as of September 30 of each school year shall not exceed 90% of the average student-teacher ratio in general education classes for the same grades in that attendance center. (23 Ill. Adm. Code 228.30 (b)(1))*

In an attempt to achieve compliance, the limited choice application process was used to manage the general education class sizes at the TWI schools. The goal was to maintain high enrollments without going over the class size guidelines. In addition, fewer TWI applications were approved. The decrease in the number of approved TWI applications, along with increasing enrollments of Spanish-speaking ELs, has resulted in a shift in the last six years from classrooms which included approximately equal numbers of Spanish-speaking English Learners (ELs) and non-ELs to classrooms where approximately 65 percent of the students are Spanish-speaking ELs.

Despite the efforts outlined above, the district remains out of compliance for 32 of the 36 TWI classrooms. Table 4 shows the TWI enrollments and average general education class sizes by school and grade. The grade levels that were in compliance as of September 30th are highlighted. During the 2013-14 school year, the year of the bilingual monitoring review, 27 of the 36 TWI classrooms were out of compliance.

#### *Managing Enrollments at Dewey and Washington*

When the Board reviewed enrollment projections in November 2015, the Office of Research, Accountability, and Data (RAD) informed the Board that it would conduct a space and enrollment analysis at seven schools where the potential for large class sizes existed. Based on this analysis, four elementary schools (Dewey, Lincoln, Washington, and Willard) seemed likely to have

kindergarten class sizes above Board-approved class size guidelines based on projected enrollment and available space.

Throughout the registration period for the 2016-17 school year, RAD communicated with parents of incoming kindergarten students at these schools that the potential for class sizes above kindergarten guidelines (23 students) was high and that several magnet program and permissive transfer options existed.

In addition, RAD regularly monitored class sizes at these schools over the course of the summer. In cases where class sizes approached the guideline, additional communication was undertaken to inform families that class sizes had exceeded guidelines and that magnet and permissive transfer options continued to be open to them. Further, new families who registered after this communication was sent were encouraged at the time of registration to apply for magnet or permissive transfers.

These actions have proven sufficient for managing enrollment in all but one case: Dewey Elementary School. During the week before school began, Dewey's kindergarten enrollment exceeded class size guidelines due to newly registered students. As a result, a teaching assistant was assigned to Dewey's kindergarten classes and additional students were selected for the TWI program (using the normal lottery process) to bring class sizes back within guidelines.

## Planned Actions

### *Enrollment Projections Methodology*

Given the accuracy rates of our existing methodology, RAD plans to continue using the same straight-line projections methodology. This has yielded better results than those methodologies considered in the past, and serves us well from a macro planning standpoint. At the more micro school/grade level, we plan to continue use of the enrollment management strategies detailed above.

### *Bilingual Compliance*

A planning team that included Peter Godard (Chief Officer, Research, Accountability, and Data), Lauren Leitao (Bilingual and ESL Program Director), John Price (Assistant Superintendent of Schools), and Lora Taira (Director, Research, Accountability, and Data) engaged in a thorough analysis and planning process during the summer and fall of 2016 around bilingual compliance. A need for an additional strand of TWI in both the Chute and Haven feeder patterns was identified (see Table 5). Elementary school principals were consulted and engaged throughout the process.

The following factors were considered:

- Average number of Spanish-speaking ELs at each attendance area school over a 3-year period,
- Percent growth in population of Spanish speaking ELs since the 13-14 school year,
- Average number of permissive transfer and/or magnet applications received from each attendance area school over a 3-year period,
- School level enrollment projections,
- Number of students from the attendance area at school who might be displaced by the addition of a TWI strand,
- Feeder pattern alignment (preference for Chute and Haven),
- Existing programs in the schools, and
- Benefits and disadvantages of having more than one strand of TWI at a school.

Next steps include:

- Further engage families and staff in conversations around the expansion of the TWI program
- Finalize program placement and submit a proposal to the board for approval
- Recruit students for program at selected site(s)
- Hire TWI teachers and bilingual T.A.s
- Plan for allocation of bilingual support staff
- Formalize transition plan for general education teachers being displaced
- Purchase instructional materials

### *Enrollment Management*

Based on the results of the current enrollment management strategy, RAD plans to enact the same strategy for the coming school year with particular attention to recruitment of families at Dewey for our magnet schools and programs. This approach puts the choice for staying in a larger class or moving to another school in the hands of families. Another possible approach would be to enact a cap and transfer or districtwide enrollment policy, but this approach would be more disruptive to the community and should be considered only on a districtwide basis.

**Table 1**

Enrollment Projections Analysis by District and School: 2012-13 through 2016-17															
Location	2012 - 13			2013-14			2014-15			2015-16			2016-17		
	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate
District	6929	7027	-1.4%	7171	7116	0.8%	7234	7216	0.2%	7333	7371	-0.5%	7456	7559	-1.4%
Dawes	361	368	-2%	377	375	1%	372	368	1%	366	360	2%	353	375	-6%
Dewey	496	492	1%	501	493	2%	502	467	7%	477	518	-8%	519	538	-4%
Kingsley	368	387	-5%	391	397	-2%	388	380	2%	384	378	2%	382	378	1%
Lincoln	454	475	-4%	504	521	-3%	545	572	-5%	593	526	13%	514	526	-2%
Lincolnwood	446	407	10%	410	401	2%	381	391	-3%	379	382	-1%	390	405	-4%
Oakton	413	409	1%	402	395	2%	408	414	-1%	419	417	0%	424	404	5%
Orrington	360	374	-4%	382	374	2%	362	376	-4%	388	385	1%	382	395	-3%
Walker	314	334	-6%	354	346	2%	347	341	2%	336	351	-4%	355	368	-4%
Washington	494	495	0%	501	524	-4%	529	522	1%	511	527	-3%	541	545	-1%
Willard	514	519	-1%	530	524	1%	527	515	2%	528	525	1%	540	536	1%
Chute	531	552	-4%	536	519	3%	533	537	-1%	543	575	-6%	584	601	-3%
Haven	744	743	0%	772	752	3%	790	778	2%	798	794	1%	808	833	-3%
Nichols	554	542	2%	575	565	2%	610	611	0%	673	680	-1%	728	718	1%
Bessie Rhodes	353	361	-2%	366	357	3%	363	373	-3%	372	372	0%	371	361	3%
King Lab	527	569	-7%	570	573	-1%	577	571	1%	566	581	-3%	566	576	-2%

**Table 2**

Grade Level Enrollment Projections Analysis: 2012-13 through 2016-17															
Grade	2012 - 13			2013-14			2014-15			2015-16			2016-17		
	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate	Projected	Actual	Error Rate
K*	800	863	-7.3%	839	823	1.9%	826	823	0.4%	832	820	1.5%	830	815	1.8%
1	822	809	2%	863	878	-2%	823	839	-2%	823	824	0%	820	845	-3%
2	825	837	-1%	809	803	1%	878	890	-1%	839	827	1%	824	835	-1%
3	812	806	1%	837	827	1%	803	787	2%	890	909	-2%	827	833	-1%
4	818	821	0%	806	810	0%	827	818	1%	787	800	-2%	909	921	-1%
5	731	748	-2%	821	825	0%	810	801	1%	818	811	1%	800	831	-4%
6	713	722	-1%	748	739	1%	825	809	2%	801	805	0%	811	817	-1%
7	713	726	-2%	722	703	3%	739	734	1%	809	831	-3%	805	820	-2%
8	695	695	0%	726	708	3%	703	715	-2%	734	744	-1%	831	842	-1%

\* For 2012-13 and prior, kindergarten enrollments were estimated using births-to-kindergarten ratios. In 2013-14 a three-year rolling average was used. Starting in 2014-15, a five-year rolling average was used to calculate projected kindergarten enrollments.

**Table 3**

**ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS: DISTRICT\***  
**(\*Excludes Park, Rice, and JEH Education Center)**  
September 30, 2016

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>KDGN</b>	<b>GR.1</b>	<b>GR.2</b>	<b>GR.3</b>	<b>GR.4</b>	<b>GR.5</b>	<b>GR.6</b>	<b>GR.7</b>	<b>GR.8</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>INC/DEC</b>
2016-17	815	845	835	833	921	831	817	820	842	7559	188
2017-18	829	815	845	835	833	921	831	817	820	7546	-13
2018-19	822	829	815	845	835	833	921	831	817	7548	2
2019-20	822	822	829	815	845	835	833	921	831	7553	5
2020-21	822	822	822	829	815	845	835	833	921	7544	-9
2021-22	822	822	822	822	829	815	845	835	833	7445	-99

Table 4

## ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS BY SCHOOL

YEAR	KDGN	GR.1	GR.2	GR.3	GR.4	GR.5	TOTAL
BESSIE RHODES							
2016-17	35	38	38	37	44	40	232
2017-18	36	35	38	38	37	44	228
2018-19	35	36	35	38	38	37	219
2019-20	35	35	36	35	38	38	217
2020-21	35	35	35	36	35	38	214
2021-22	35	35	35	35	36	35	211
DAWES							
2016-17	65	58	58	66	68	60	375
2017-18	66	65	58	58	66	68	381
2018-19	66	66	65	58	58	66	379
2019-20	66	66	66	65	58	58	379
2020-21	66	66	66	66	65	58	387
2021-22	66	66	66	66	66	65	395
DEWEY							
2016-17	96	100	82	85	95	80	538
2017-18	98	96	100	82	85	95	556
2018-19	97	98	96	100	82	85	558
2019-20	97	97	98	96	100	82	570
2020-21	97	97	97	98	96	100	585
2021-22	97	97	97	97	98	96	582
KINGSLEY							
2016-17	50	67	64	66	72	59	378
2017-18	51	50	67	64	66	72	370
2018-19	50	51	50	67	64	66	348
2019-20	50	50	51	50	67	64	332
2020-21	50	50	50	51	50	67	318
2021-22	50	50	50	50	51	50	301
LINCOLN							
2016-17	85	77	88	83	106	87	526
2017-18	86	85	77	88	83	106	525
2018-19	86	86	85	77	88	83	505
2019-20	86	86	86	85	77	88	508
2020-21	86	86	86	86	85	77	506
2021-22	86	86	86	86	86	85	515
LINCOLNWOOD							
2016-17	59	55	76	61	72	82	405
2017-18	60	59	55	76	61	72	383
2018-19	60	60	59	55	76	61	371
2019-20	59	60	60	59	55	76	369
2020-21	59	59	60	60	59	55	352
2021-22	59	59	59	60	60	59	356





**Table 4**

## ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS BY SCHOOL

YEAR	GR.6	GR.7	GR.8	TOTAL
BESSIE RHODES				
2016-17	39	46	44	129
2017-18	40	39	46	125
2018-19	44	40	39	123
2019-20	37	44	40	121
2020-21	38	37	44	119
2021-22	38	38	37	113
CHUTE				
2016-17	192	204	205	601
2017-18	186	192	204	582
2018-19	210	186	192	588
2019-20	192	210	186	588
2020-21	180	192	210	582
2021-22	184	180	192	556
HAVEN				
2015-16	266	281	286	833
2016-17	284	266	281	831
2017-18	303	284	266	853
2018-19	276	303	284	863
2019-20	309	276	303	888
2020-21	282	309	276	867
MARTIN LUTHER KING JR.				
2016-17	61	66	71	198
2017-18	63	61	66	190
2018-19	69	63	61	193
2019-20	72	69	63	204
2020-21	61	72	69	202
2021-22	59	61	72	192
NICHOLS				
2016-17	259	223	236	718
2017-18	258	259	223	740
2018-19	295	258	259	812
2019-20	256	295	258	809
2020-21	247	256	295	798
2021-22	282	247	256	785

**Table 5**

**Bilingual Compliance by School and Grade: TWI and General Education Class Sizes as of September 30**

		2016-17				2015-16				2014-15				2013-14			
Site	Grade	TWI			GenEd	TWI			GenEd	TWI			GenEd	TWI			GenEd
		Non EL	EL	Total TWI	Avg. Class Size	Non EL	EL	Total TWI	Avg. Class Size	Non EL	EL	Total TWI	Avg. Class Size	Non EL	EL	Total TWI	Avg. Class Size
Dawes	K	5	18	23	19.0	8	16	24	13.0	9	15	24	15.0	10	13	23	20.0
	1	9	13	22	16.5	10	14	24	15.5	10	13	23	19.0	12	9	21	21.5
	2	10	14	24	15.0	10	13	23	17.5	12	9	21	19.0	10	12	22	17.0
	3	10	14	24	17.5	12	10	22	19.0	9	11	20	17.0	9	12	21	21.0
	4	18	4	22	22.0	15	7	22	17.5	12	5	17	22.0	19	5	24	19.5
	5	17	4	21	17.5	14	5	19	19.5	22	2	24	18.0	21	2	23	21.5
Dewey	K	9	13	22	24.7	8	12	20	23.3	7	15	22	17.7	9	14	23	20.7
	1	10	14	24	25.3	5	16	21	20.7	8	14	22	19.0	9	10	19	25.7
	2	6	17	23	19.7	9	15	24	21.7	10	12	22	22.7	10	7	17	18.0
	3	9	15	24	20.3	9	11	20	25.3	9	8	17	15.3	11	8	19	22.7
	4	16	7	23	24.0	14	4	18	17.3	12	6	18	22.0	16	3	19	19.7
	5	15	7	22	19.3	15	3	18	24.0	16	2	18	17.7	14	0	14	20.7
Oakton	K	6	12	18	22.0	5	12	17	19.5	7	13	20	22.0	9	14	23	18.0
	1	4	12	16	16.0	7	12	19	21.0	8	14	22	17.5	9	13	22	15.0
	2	5	12	17	17.5	10	15	25	13.5	10	10	20	17.0	8	13	21	11.5
	3	5	15	20	12.0	9	12	21	19.0	8	13	21	22.0	8	9	17	16.0
	4	12	8	20	18.0	17	7	24	22.0	10	9	19	16.5	13	5	18	18.0
	5	17	5	22	23.0	11	6	17	16.0	15	3	18	17.0	9	5	14	15.5
Washington	K	20	24	44	23.0	23	21	44	18.3	18	26	44	18.0	20	24	44	22.5
	1	22	26	48	19.0	16	23	39	18.5	22	25	47	21.5	24	20	44	24.5
	2	13	25	38	19.5	20	25	45	19.0	22	22	44	24.5	19	26	45	19.5
	3	18	27	45	21.5	19	23	42	27.5	18	26	44	20.5	24	18	42	22.0
	4	25	14	39	27.5	29	12	41	22.5	32	11	43	19.5	38	8	46	21.0
	5	36	10	46	22.5	38	5	43	21.5	39	7	46	23.0	30	5	35	24.5
Willard	K	6	17	23	19.3	10	13	23	23.7	8	15	23	22.0	10	13	23	22.7
	1	10	13	23	24.7	7	15	22	23.0	11	13	24	22.3	8	15	23	23.7
	2	6	17	23	23.0	11	13	24	20.7	7	17	24	23.0	12	12	24	20.7
	3	11	12	23	20.7	8	13	21	22.3	9	13	22	21.0	11	9	20	22.7
	4	16	5	21	23.3	14	9	23	21.0	11	7	18	20.7	15	6	21	18.7
	5	13	11	24	22.0	12	7	19	20.3	18	3	21	18.7	17	0	17	23.7

**Table 6 Kindergarten TWI English Learners by Feeder Pattern as of September 30 - Number of TWI Classroom Needed for 12 or Fewer Students Per Classroom**

	2016-17			15-16			14-15			13-14		
	TWI-EL	Classes Need	TWI-EL by Class	TWI-EL	Classes Need	TWI-EL by Class	TWI-EL	Classes Need	TWI-EL by Class	TWI-EL	Classes Need	TWI-EL by Class
Chute (currently 2 TWI classrooms)	40	4	10.0	32	3	10.7	41	4	10.3	36	3	12.0
Haven (currently 1 TWI classroom)	22	2	11.0	21	2	10.5	20	2	10.0	17	2	8.5
Nichols (currently 3 TWI classrooms)	22	2	11.0	20	2	10.0	24	2	12.0	25	3	8.3