# Overview of Community and School Demographics and Methods of Enrollment Projections

Presented to Morris County School Boards Association

March 22, 2017

Ross Haber and Associates, LLC

# **Selected Demographic Data Points – Morris County**

	Morri	s County											
	2010	2015	Diff	Percent									
Population	489,811	498,192	8,381	1.71%									
Median Age	40.50	42.00	1.50	3.70%									
Housing	189,845	191,287	1,442	0.76%									
Median Income	\$96,747.00	\$100,214.00	\$3,467.00	3.58%									
Mean Income	\$128,371.00	\$134,252.00	\$5,881.00	4.58%									
Ethnicity													
White	372,899	363,201	-9,698	-2.60%									
Black	14,411	15,057	646	4.48%									
Hispanic	52,897	61,934	9,037	17.08%									
Asian	46,672	48,124	1,452	3.11%									
Other	2,932	9,867	6,935	236.53%									
	School E	Enrollment											
Total	95,819	92,974	-2,845	-2.97%									
Public	69,342	77,849	8,507	12.27%									
Private	18,397	15,125	-3,272	-17.79%									
Note: In 2010 non-public school enrollment comprised 19.2% of students enrolled in schools in Morris County. In 2015 non public enrollment decreased to 16.3% of the students enrolled in schools in Morris County.													

# **Morris County School Enrollment**

Morris Cou	inty Enro	ollment	Change	s 2010-2015						
	2010	2015	Diff	Percent						
NJDOE	78,565	76,111	-2,454	-3.12%						
Enrolled	Children	ո (Public	and No	n-Public)						
Total	95,819	92,791	-3,028	-3.16%						
Public	78,565	76,111	-2,454	-3.12%						
Non-Public	17,254	16,680	-574	-3.33%						
Percentage	of Enroll	ment Pu	ıblic an	d Non-Public						
Public	81.99%	82.02%								
Non-Public	18.01%	17.98%								
Note: This	Note: This data is taken from two different									
data source	es (NJDO	E and US	Census	s)						

## **School Enrollment Trends—Sample Districts**

District Trends (2 years) Sample													
District	Base	Recent	Diff	Projected	Diff	10 Year							
Bridgewater-Raritan	8,733	8,688	-45	8,444	-244	-3.31%							
<b>Burlington City</b>	1,880	1,702	-178	1,786	84	-5.00%							
Cresskill Borough	970	982	12	1,089	107	12.27%							
East Rutherford	772	802	30	803	1	4.02%							
Eatontown Borough	1,053	1,052	-1	1,010	-42	-4.08%							
Garfield City	4,744	4,993	249	5,280	287	11.30%							
Glen Ridge	1,932	1,921	-11	1,908	-13	-1.24%							
Hanover	1,581	1,485	-96	1,438	-47	-9.04%							
Highland Park	1,925	1,953	28	1,989	36	3.32%							
Middlesex Borough	2,106	2,082	-24	2,053	-29	-2.52%							
Ridgewood	5,753	5,648	-105	5,473	-175	-4.87%							
Chester Twp/Bor	1,378	1,140	-238	1,021	-119	-25.91%							
Mendham Bor	669	628	-41	500	-128	-25.26%							
Mendham Twp	899	708	-191	598	-110	-33.48%							
Washington Twp	2,740	2,217	-523	2,015	-202	-26.46%							
Nutley	3,931	4,054	123	4,309	255	9.62%							
Upper Saddle River	1,341	1,189	-152	1,310	121	-2.31%							
Woodbridge	13,081	13,787	706	14,225	438	8.75%							
Springfield	2,122	2,278	156	2,409	131	13.52%							
Weehawken	1,251	1,361	110	1,401	40	11.99%							
Somerville	2,423	2,424	1	2,488	64	2.68%							
South Brunswick	5,753	5,733	-20	5,615	-118	-2.40%							
Denville	1,856	1,974	118	1,570	-404	-15.41%							
S Orange-Maplewood	6,459	6,912	453	7,243	331	12.14%							
Total	75,352	75,713	361	75,977	264	0.83%							
Total (Morris)	9,123	8,152	-971	7,142	-1,010	-21.71%							

Sample is based upon selected studies done by Ross Haber and Associates



### **Base of Study: Cohort Survival Method**

The cohort survival method follows groups of students as they move from grade to grade over a six-year period.

Year	Births	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	K-2	3-5	6-8	Total	SCSE	PK	Total	
																						K-8				
2011-12	20	126		129		140		146		153		156		157		174		143	395	455	474	1324	3	14	1341	
			0.99		1.08		1.09		1.04		1.01		1.01		1.01		1.02									
2012-13	20	107		125		139		152		152		154		158		158		177	371	458	493	1322	3	14	1339	-0.15%
			1.03		1.03		1.09		1.00		1.01		1.05		1.00		0.98									
2013-14	18	112		110		129		152		152		154		161		158		155	351	458	474	1283	4	21	1308	-2.32%
			0.97		1.01		1.00		0.96		1.01		1.05		0.98		1.00									
2014-15	12	109		109		111		129		146		153		162					329	428	478	1235	1	12	1248	-4.59%
			1.05		1.08		1.10		0.98		1.00		1.01		1.01		0.97									
2015-16	24	106		114		118		122		127		146		155		164		153	338	395	472	1205	2	17	1224	-1.92%
			0.93		1.09		1.08		1.02		0.99		0.97		1.01		1.02									
2016-17	13	93		99		124		127		124		126		142		156		168	316	377	466	1159	8	22	1189	-2.86%
Av			0.99		1.06		1.07		1.00		1.00		1.02		1.00		1.00									-2.37%
Year	Births	K		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	K-2	3-5	6-8	Total	SCSE	PK	Total	
																					K-8	K-8				
2016-17	15	112		93		105		133		127		124		128		142		156	309	384	426	1120	2	16	1137	-7.07%
2017-18	15	128		111		98		112		133		128		127		129		142	337	373	397	1107	2	20	1129	-0.72%
2018-19	16	132		127		118		105		112		133		130		127		128	377	350	385	1113	2	22	1136	0.61%
2019-20	17	136		131		134		126		105		113		136		130		127	402	344	393	1138	2	22	1162	2.26%
2020-21	15	141		135		139		144		126		105		115		136		130	415	375	381	1172	2	24	1197	3.05%

#### **Projecting Kindergarten Enrollment**

Method 1: Birth to Kindergarten—students born in a given year will become kindergarten students five years later (e.g.-children born in 2006 became kindergarten students in 2011). A five year average between births and kindergarten is completed to develop a growth/decline ratio. From this kindergarten projections are made.

Comment: After reviewing past projections it is our opinion that due to the changing nature of population movements and changes this is no longer, for the most part, an accurate predictor of kindergarten enrollment.

**Method 2:** Moving Average-This calculates an average for each five year period prior to the projected years. This is then averaged over the projected years.

Comment: We have found that in most cases this method had produced a more accurate projection for kindergarten enrollment and, we did not find any case in which it produced a worse result.

It is important to note that a poor kindergarten projection impacts the entire projection.

#### **Additional Data for Projections**

#### Future Housing Developments:

- 1. Compiling data regarding current residential construction and approved new residential housing units by unit type: single family, multi-family, etc.
- 2. A yield factor needs to be developed for each type of unit:
  Method 1: Use of the "Rutgers Study." this provides various yield factors for different geographic regions of the state. (a yield factor is the projected number of school aged children that come from various types of units.

**Comment:** The Rutgers Study was done in 2006. In addition to it being more than 11 years old, it also was completed prior to the housing collapse and the many changes in Affordable Housing. We no longer utilize the Rutgers Study in our projections of new housing.

#### **Additional Data for Projections**

#### **Method 2:** District Specific Yield Ratios:

- Calculate actual yields based upon similar housing types within the District and/or comparable Districts.
- 2. Factor in COAH units to adjust student yields.

This data is added to the cohort projections based upon estimated completion dates.

Analysis of Existing Housing Sales: A review of several years of housing sales in a community compared to the changes in the historical school enrollments.

### **Uses of Enrollment Projections**

- 1. Budget Planning
- 2. Analysis of enrollments in each of the schools to assess enrollment balances
- 3. Facility Analysis: How the current facilities can accommodate future enrollments and/or where space for special programs can be found
- 4. Analysis of current attendance zones for future planning.