Roth IAMS
Integrated Asset Management Strategies

WHITE PAPER | MASTER & SPACE PLANNING

K–12 Enrollment Forecasting Models, Cohort Survival Methods, and GIS-Based Demographic Analysis

Methodological Evolution, Comparative Assessment, and International Perspectives

By Roth IAMS | October 2026

Abstract

Accurate enrollment forecasting is foundational to responsible school facility planning, capital investment, and equitable resource allocation in K–12 education systems. This white paper provides a comprehensive review of the principal methodologies employed to project student enrollment, including the cohort-survival method (CSM), the housing unit method (HUM), regression-based approaches, GIS-integrated demographic models, and emerging machine-learning frameworks. The paper traces the historical development of these techniques from the post-war era through the COVID-19 disruption, synthesizes evidence on their respective advantages and limitations, and compares outcomes and practices across North America, Europe, Asia-Pacific, and developing regions. The findings confirm that no single method is universally superior; instead, hybrid, spatially aware, and equity-centered approaches represent the current frontier of best practice.

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

1. Introduction 4

2. Overview of K–12 Enrollment Forecasting Methodologies 5

2.1 Cohort-Survival Method (CSM) 5

2.2 Housing Unit Method (HUM) 6

2.3 Regression-Based and Time-Series Approaches 6

2.4 GIS-Based Demographic Analysis 6

2.5 Machine Learning and Ensemble Methods 7

2.6 System Dynamics Models 7

3. Advantages and Disadvantages Assessment 8

4. Historical Development of Enrollment Forecasting 9

4.1 The Computational Revolution (1980s–1990s) 10

4.2 The Open Data Era (2000s–2010s) 10

4.3 The COVID Shock and Resilience Imperative (2020–Present) 10

4.4 Declining Fertility as a Structural Enrollment Challenge 10

5. GIS-Based Demographic Analysis: Methods and Applications 11

5.1 Data Layers in a GIS-Based Enrollment Forecasting System 12

5.2 Spatial Allocation and Yield Factor Disaggregation 12

5.3 Equity Applications of GIS Analysis 12

6. International Comparison: United States and Global K–12 Contexts 13

6.1 United States 14

6.2 Canada 15

6.3 United Kingdom 15

6.4 Australia 15

6.5 East Asia: Japan and South Korea 16

6.6 Developing Regions 16

7. Synthesizing Best Practices and Future Directions 16

8. Conclusion 17

References 19

1. Introduction

School enrollment forecasting sits at the intersection of demography, spatial analysis, public finance, and educational policy. Boards of education, school districts, and provincial or state education ministries depend on enrollment projections to make decisions about new school construction, facility renovations, boundary revisions, teacher hiring, and program funding — decisions that carry consequences lasting decades and costing hundreds of millions of dollars.

The central methodological challenge is that student populations are shaped by forces that span multiple scales and timeframes: national fertility trends, local migration and housing markets, school-choice regulations, immigration policy, and even global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Enrollment forecast errors carry direct fiscal and social consequences: even modest inaccuracies can result in significant misallocated capital expenditure, misaligned staffing, and inequitable resource distribution across districts. Accuracy, therefore, has direct fiscal and social implications.

Among the most consequential long-run drivers of enrollment is the national birth rate. In the United States, the general fertility rate — defined as live births per 1,000 females ages 15–44 — declined from approximately 62.5 in 2015 to 54.5 in 2023, a reduction of roughly 13% over eight years, before stabilizing at 54.6 in 2024 (Hamilton, Martin, & Osterman, 2025). Total births fell from approximately 3.98 million in 2015 to 3.60 million in 2023, a decline of nearly 400,000 births annually. Because kindergarten cohorts are anchored to birth counts from five to six years prior, this sustained reduction in natality is now registering as structurally smaller entering classes across many U.S. school districts. The National Center for Education Statistics has explicitly acknowledged that declining birth cohorts, compounded by COVID-19 disruptions, are expected to reduce projected enrollment levels as smaller birth cohorts mature to school age (NCES, 2023). Planners who rely solely on backward-looking enrollment ratios risk systematically overestimating future kindergarten entry if the local birth trend has weakened.

This white paper:

- Reviews and compares the principal enrollment forecasting methodologies used in K–12 settings;
- Traces the historical evolution of forecasting methods from the 1950s to the present;
- Assesses the advantages and disadvantages of each approach;
- Evaluates the role of GIS-based spatial analysis as an enhancement to traditional demographic modeling; and
- Compares forecasting outcomes and methodological adoption across the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, East Asia, and developing regions.

2. Overview of K–12 Enrollment Forecasting Methodologies

Six broad methodological families dominate the literature and practitioner community. Table 1 provides a comparative summary.

Table 1. Comparative Overview of K–12 Enrollment Forecasting Methods

Method	Description	Data Requirements	Typical Accuracy (MAPE)
Cohort-Survival (CSM)	Tracks grade cohorts from year to year using survival ratios derived from historical enrollment data.	3–10 yrs enrollment, birth records	2–5%
Linear Regression	Fits trend lines to enrollment time series; simple, but assumes stationarity.	5+ yrs enrollment data	4–8%
Housing Unit Method (HUM)	Applies student yield factors to residential housing starts and occupancy rates.	Building permits, census, housing data	3–7%
GIS-Based Demographic	Combines spatial analysis of residential growth with demographic profiling and travel-time/attendance-zone modeling.	GIS layers, census, parcel data	2–4%
Bayesian / Machine Learning	Uses probabilistic or algorithmic frameworks incorporating socioeconomic, demographic, and school-choice variables.	Multi-source big data	1–3%
System Dynamics	Simulation model of feedback loops (birth rates, migration, school capacity) over time.	Longitudinal multi-sector data	2–5%

Sources: Caldas & Bankston (1997); Tanner & Lackney (2006); NCES (2023). MAPE = Mean Absolute Percentage Error (illustrative, typical ranges from published studies).

2.1 Cohort-Survival Method (CSM)

The cohort-survival method — also called the grade-progression ratio or cohort-progression method — is the most widely adopted enrollment forecasting technique in North American K–12 practice (Tanner & Lackney, 2006). The method tracks successive grade cohorts through a school system by applying empirically derived survival ratios to current enrollment figures.

A survival ratio for grade transition (g → g+1) is computed as:

$$SR(g) = Enroll\ (g+1,\ t) \,/\, Enroll\ (g,\ t–1)$$

Ratios are typically averaged over three to ten historical years to smooth out anomalous fluctuations. Kindergarten entry is anchored to area birth records from five to six years prior, adjusted for private-school draw and pre-kindergarten participation rates (Murdock & Ellis, 1991). Because the U.S. general fertility rate has declined approximately 13% since 2015 — reaching 54.5 births per 1,000 females ages 15–44 in 2023 (Hamilton, Martin, & Osterman, 2025) — practitioners must update their kindergarten entry anchors from current birth certificate data rather

than extrapolating from older enrollment ratios alone; failing to do so will systematically overestimate future cohort sizes in communities whose local fertility trends mirror the national decline.

The CSM is valued for its transparency, low cost, and alignment with institutional expectations. Its principal limitation is that it is backward-looking: it cannot anticipate changes in community demographics that have not yet appeared in the enrollment record. Districts experiencing rapid immigration, large condominium developments, or sudden economic decline routinely find that pure CSM projections diverge from realized enrollment within two to three years of a structural shift (Stine & Carrel, 2018).

2.2 Housing Unit Method (HUM)

The housing unit method (also called the dwelling unit or residential method) estimates future enrollment by applying empirically derived student-yield factors to projected housing stock. The yield factor for a given housing type (e.g., single-family detached, apartment, townhouse) represents the average number of K–12 students per occupied unit of that type.

HUM is particularly effective in rapidly growing communities where new residential development is a primary driver of changes in enrollment. Tompkins (2000) demonstrated that yield factors vary systematically by housing type, age of development, and socioeconomic profile; single-family homes typically yield 0.35–0.55 K–12 students per unit, while apartments yield 0.10–0.25 students per unit. The method requires reliable building-permit data and periodic recalibration of yield factors as community demographics evolve.

2.3 Regression-Based and Time-Series Approaches

Ordinary least squares regression applied to enrollment time series offers a straightforward method for extrapolating trends. Augmented specifications incorporate independent demographic variables — such as population age structure, poverty rates, labor force participation, or housing vacancy rates — as predictors (Caldas & Bankston, 1997).

The primary weakness of regression-based approaches is their assumption of trend stationarity. Large structural shifts — school openings or closures, boundary changes, or policy-driven migration — violate this assumption and can produce severely biased projections.

2.4 GIS-Based Demographic Analysis

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) have transformed enrollment forecasting by enabling analysts to layer student address data, residential parcel data, census demographic profiles, and school attendance boundaries in an integrated spatial framework (Theobald, 2003). GIS-based approaches do not replace cohort-survival or housing unit methods; rather, they enhance them by disaggregating projections to the attendance zone, neighborhood, or even parcel level.

Key GIS applications in enrollment forecasting include:

- Spatial allocation of census age-cohort data to school attendance zones to estimate potential K–12 populations;
- Integration of residential building-permit point data with yield factors to project grade-specific enrollment by zone;
- Drive-time and network analysis to evaluate proposed attendance-zone boundaries for equity and efficiency;
- Demographic heat-mapping to identify concentrations of school-age children and inform new-school siting decisions; and
- Change-detection analysis overlaying historical aerial imagery with parcel data to track housing density transitions.

A seminal contribution by Theobald (2003) demonstrated that GIS-enabled forecasts in Colorado school districts achieved mean absolute percentage errors (MAPE) of 2–4% versus 5–9% for unaided CSM, particularly in districts with rapid residential growth at the urban fringe. Subsequent research in metropolitan Toronto replicated this finding in a Canadian context, confirming the superiority of the spatial approach when neighborhood-level demographic variation is high.

2.5 Machine Learning and Ensemble Methods

Since approximately 2015, researchers and large urban districts have explored machine learning (ML) as a complement or alternative to traditional methods. Supervised algorithms — including Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) neural networks — can incorporate dozens of predictor variables and capture non-linear relationships that linear methods miss. Pilot studies in large urban districts suggest that gradient boosting ensembles can outperform CSM on multi-year holdout tests, with MAPE reductions of 50% or more in stable demographic environments.

Pilot applications in large urban districts have reported that gradient boosting and similar ensemble models can outperform CSM on out-of-sample holdout tests, though authors have cautioned that model performance degrades rapidly when training data did not include periods of demographic disruption analogous to the forecast horizon.

Bayesian hierarchical models offer an alternative probabilistic framework that accommodates uncertainty at multiple geographic scales while incorporating prior demographic knowledge (Gelman & Hill, 2007). These models are increasingly used to generate probabilistic enrollment bands (e.g., 80th-percentile corridors) rather than single-point estimates. That shift has significant implications for risk-informed capital planning.

2.6 System Dynamics Models

System dynamics (SD) models, rooted in Forrester's (1961) industrial dynamics framework, simulate enrollment as an emergent property of interconnected feedback loops: birth rates, grade-to-grade progression, migration, housing supply, labor markets, and school program attractiveness. SD models excel at capturing long-horizon (10–25-year) behavior under policy

scenarios but require extensive parameterization and are rarely employed outside research settings or large provincial/state-level planning exercises.

3. Advantages and Disadvantages Assessment

Table 2 provides an illustrative cohort-survival working example for a hypothetical mid-size school district, demonstrating how to compute survival ratios and projected enrollment for Year 4.

Table 2. Illustrative Cohort-Survival Working Example – Hypothetical District (K–12)

Grade Cohort	Yr 1 Enroll.	Yr 2 Enroll.	Yr 3 Enroll.	Avg. Survival Ratio	Projected Yr 4
K → Gr. 1	312	318	305	**0.991**	**302**
Gr. 1 → 2	318	310	316	**0.985**	**311**
Gr. 2 → 3	310	320	312	**0.998**	**311**
Gr. 3 → 4	295	302	308	**1.022**	**315**
Gr. 4 → 5	290	298	305	**1.026**	**313**
Gr. 5 → 6	285	292	299	**1.025**	**306**
Gr. 6 → 7	302	295	290	**0.979**	**284**
Gr. 7 → 8	290	305	300	**1.017**	**305**
Gr. 8 → 9	310	298	308	**0.997**	**307**
Gr. 9 → 10	320	312	315	**0.992**	**312**
Gr. 10 → 11	310	295	302	**0.987**	**298**
Gr. 11 → 12	295	290	288	**0.988**	**285**

Note: Survival ratios are averaged over three historical years. Projected Year 4 enrollment = Year 3 enrollment × average survival ratio. Kindergarten entry (not shown) is anchored to local birth records from six years prior.

Table 3 summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of each major method. These assessments synthesize findings from the peer-reviewed literature and reflect consensus views among educational planning practitioners.

Table 3. Advantages and Disadvantages of Major Enrollment Forecasting Methods

Method	Advantages	Disadvantages
Cohort-Survival	Widely accepted; transparent; low data cost; easily updated annually.	Backward-looking; poor under rapid demographic change; ignores spatial dynamics.
Linear Regression	Simple computation; interpretable coefficients; useful for stable districts.	Assumes linear trend; sensitive to outliers; cannot model non-stationary enrollment.
Housing Unit Method	Captures new residential development; proactive planning tool.	Requires reliable permit data; yield factors vary by housing type and community.

Method	Advantages	Disadvantages
GIS-Based Demographic	Spatially granular; integrates multiple data sources; reveals attendance-zone inequities.	High data and skill demands; proprietary GIS software cost; privacy concerns.
Machine Learning / AI	Highest accuracy potential; handles non-linear patterns; scalable.	'Black box' interpretability issues; data hunger; requires specialist staff.

Sources: Tanner & Lackney (2006); Murdock & Ellis (1991); Theobald (2003).

Several cross-cutting observations emerge from this comparative analysis:

- Transparency and stakeholder trust. School boards and education ministries routinely prefer CSM and HUM because their assumptions are legible to non-technical audiences. ML models, despite higher accuracy, have encountered institutional resistance due to their opacity (Lundberg & Lee, 2017).
- Data infrastructure is a binding constraint. GIS and ML methods are substantially more accurate, but they require sustained investment in data governance, staff capacity, and technology platforms that many districts — particularly small or rural ones — cannot afford.
- Volatility sensitivity. COVID-19 enrollment shocks of 2020–21 revealed that all deterministic trend-based methods are fragile in the face of unprecedented discontinuities. This has accelerated interest in ensemble and probabilistic approaches that explicitly convey planning uncertainty.
- Scale dependence. CSM performs adequately at the district level but degrades at the school level, where cohort sizes are small and subject to high relative sampling variance. GIS-based methods maintain accuracy at the school and attendance-zone levels where they matter most for capital planning.

4. Historical Development of Enrollment Forecasting

The sophistication of K–12 enrollment forecasting has evolved substantially over seven decades, driven by demographic change, computational advances, expanding data infrastructure, and policy demands. Table 4 presents a structured chronological overview.

Table 4. Historical Development Timeline – K–12 Enrollment Forecasting and GIS Demographic Analysis

Era / Period	Key Developments in K–12 Enrollment Forecasting & GIS Demographic Analysis
1950s–60s	Post-war baby boom forces school boards to adopt systematic forecasting. The cohort-survival method was formalized by researchers, including Lowry (1964). Projections are largely paper-based and aggregate.
1970s	Demographic transition following the baby bust prompts refinement of survival ratios. U.S. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) standardizes reporting frameworks. Housing Unit Method gains traction in high-growth Sun Belt districts.
1990s	Desktop GIS (ArcView, 1994) enables school districts to map attendance zones and overlay census data. NCES publishes 'Projections of Education Statistics' annually. Hodgkinson (1992) integrates demographic diversity into forecasting frameworks.

Era / Period	Key Developments in K–12 Enrollment Forecasting & GIS Demographic Analysis
2000s	Internet dissemination of American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates transforms data availability. Multi-variable regression and scenario planning become mainstream. Journal of Education Finance publishes methodological comparisons.
2010s	Machine learning pilots appear in large urban districts (Los Angeles, New York). Open-source GIS (QGIS) reduces cost barriers. Charter school proliferation complicates attendance-zone-based models.
2020–Present	COVID-19 causes unprecedented enrollment declines (–3% nationally in 2020–21), exposing limitations of trend-based models. Ensemble / hybrid models, along with real-time data dashboards, emerge. Equity-centered GIS analysis addresses demographic disparities.

Sources: Lowry (1964); Hodgkinson (1992); Theobald (2003); NCES (2023).

Three macro-transitions stand out as particularly consequential:

4.1 The Computational Revolution (1980s–1990s)

The arrival of desktop computing reduced the time required to maintain and update CSM models from weeks to hours, enabling annual recalibration as a standard practice. The concurrent emergence of desktop GIS platforms (ArcInfo, ArcView) enabled spatial demographic analysis to migrate from federal research agencies to state and district planning offices.

4.2 The Open Data Era (2000s–2010s)

The release of the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates, beginning in 2010, provided school planners with small-area demographic data at the census-tract level for the first time, at no cost. Combined with the proliferation of online building-permit databases, this dramatically lowered the data-acquisition barrier for HUM and GIS-enhanced methods. ESRI's ArcGIS Online and subsequent cloud-based platforms further democratized spatial analysis.

4.3 The COVID Shock and Resilience Imperative (2020–Present)

Between fall 2019 and fall 2020, U.S. public school enrollment declined by approximately 1.2 million students, the largest single-year drop since systematic federal tracking began, with disproportionate impacts on kindergarten and pre-K enrollment (NCES, 2022). This unprecedented event invalidated the trend assumptions underpinning most operational forecasting models and prompted a widespread re-evaluation of planning practices. The subsequent partial recovery (2021–2023) was uneven across district types and geographies, adding further complexity. These events have catalyzed interest in scenario-based and probabilistic forecasting frameworks that explicitly communicate the range of plausible futures.

4.4 Declining Fertility as a Structural Enrollment Challenge

Underlying both the COVID-19 enrollment disruption and the longer-run demographic pressures on school capacity is a structural trend that predates the pandemic: a sustained decline in U.S. birth rates. The general fertility rate peaked at approximately 69.3 births per 1,000 females ages 15–44 in 2007, just before the Great Recession, and has fallen in most subsequent years. By

2020, 43 states recorded their lowest general fertility rate in at least three decades. Although provisional 2024 data show a marginal uptick of 3,622,673 births, up 1% from 2023, with a general fertility rate of 54.6, the structural downward trajectory since 2007 leaves the general fertility rate approximately 21% below its 2007 peak (Hamilton, Martin, & Osterman, 2025). Since kindergarten cohorts typically enter school five to six years after birth, these declining birth counts translate directly into smaller incoming grade cohorts across much of the country. Table 5 presents national birth data from 2015 to 2024, illustrating the magnitude and trajectory of this trend and its implications for forecasting.

Table 5. U.S. Live Births and General Fertility Rate, 2015–2024

Year	Live Births	General Fertility Rate	Total Fertility Rate (per 1,000 women)	K–Entry Cohort Year
2015	3,977,745	62.5	1,843	2020–21
2016	3,945,875	62.0	1,820	2021–22
2017	3,855,500	60.3	1,765	2022–23
2018	3,791,712	59.1	1,729	2023–24
2019	3,745,540	58.3	1,706	2024–25
2020	3,613,647	55.8	1,637	2025–26
2021	3,664,292	56.3	1,663	2026–27
2022	3,667,758	56.0	1,664	2027–28
2023	3,596,017	54.5	1,621	2028–29
2024 (prov.)	3,622,673	54.6	1,627	2029–30

Sources: Osterman et al. (2024); Hamilton, Martin, & Osterman (2025). GFR = general fertility rate (births per 1,000 females ages 15–44). TFR = total fertility rate (births per 1,000 women, lifetime estimate). K–Entry Cohort Year = the expected kindergarten entry year for children born in the given year, assuming entry at age 5–6. 2024 data are provisional.

The implications for forecasting practice are significant. Districts experiencing sustained natality decline, particularly in metropolitan areas where the post-2007 fertility drop has been most pronounced, will see structurally smaller kindergarten cohorts entering the system through at least the late 2020s, regardless of migration or housing trends. Conversely, jurisdictions with above-average immigrant populations may see fertility rates that partially offset the national trend, underscoring the importance of using local birth certificate data (available through state vital statistics offices) rather than relying solely on national trends when anchoring kindergarten entry projections. The integration of local birth data into the CSM entry-year adjustment represents one of the lowest-cost, highest-impact improvements available to district planning offices operating under constrained analytical resources.

5. GIS-Based Demographic Analysis: Methods and Applications

Geographic Information Systems have become an indispensable tool in the advanced practitioner's forecasting toolkit. The core value proposition of GIS in this context is the ability to disaggregate aggregate demographic projections to the spatial scales at which planning decisions

are actually made, individual school catchment areas, neighborhoods, and residential development sites.

5.1 Data Layers in a GIS-Based Enrollment Forecasting System

A comprehensive GIS-based enrollment forecasting system typically integrates the following data layers:

- Student address database: geocoded annual snapshots of student home locations, linked to grade and school assignment.
- Residential parcel layer: authoritative land-registry or assessment data identifying dwelling units by type, age, assessed value, and occupancy status.
- Building permit layer: annually updated point data on new construction, demolition, and renovation permits.
- Census demographic layer: ACS 5-year estimates (U.S.), NHS (Canada), or national census data at the census-tract or enumeration-area level, including age structure and household composition.
- Attendance boundary layer: current and historically archived attendance zones for each school.
- Land-use and zoning layer: identifies residential development capacity and planned growth areas.
- Road network layer: supports travel-time analysis for boundary optimization.

5.2 Spatial Allocation and Yield Factor Disaggregation

The most powerful GIS-specific technique is spatial allocation: assigning a share of area-wide demographic projections to each attendance zone in proportion to that zone's share of total residential capacity and age-specific population. When combined with per-housing-type yield factors derived from student address analysis, this approach provides school-level projections of substantially higher granularity than aggregate district methods (Theobald, 2003).

Research in Canadian suburban school boards has demonstrated that spatially disaggregated projections can substantially reduce school-level MAPE compared to aggregate district-level CSM — in some documented cases from the high single digits to the low single digits — with the greatest improvement in schools located in high-growth suburban areas adjacent to active development.

5.3 Equity Applications of GIS Analysis

Beyond forecasting accuracy, GIS analysis is increasingly used to identify and address demographic inequities embedded in attendance zone configurations. Spatial overlay of school attendance boundaries with census socioeconomic indicators, poverty rates, racial/ethnic composition, and English-language learner concentration enables planners to assess whether

proposed boundary changes would increase or decrease demographic integration (Richards, 2014).

The National Coalition on School Diversity and similar advocacy organizations have called for equity-centered GIS analysis to be embedded in every attendance-zone revision process, arguing that traditional demographic methods render invisible the spatial dynamics of school segregation (Richards, 2014).

6. International Comparison: United States and Global K–12 Contexts

Enrollment forecasting practice varies substantially across national contexts, shaped by governance structures, demographic trends, data infrastructure, and the extent to which enrollment volatility is driven by policy (e.g., school choice, charter systems) versus pure demographic change. Table 6 provides a structured international comparison, and Table 7 presents illustrative U.S. enrollment trend data across different district typologies for the period 2015–2023.

Table 6. International Comparison of K–12 Enrollment Forecasting Methods and Outcomes

Country / Region	Primary Method Used	GIS Adoption Level	Forecast Accuracy / Notes	Key Challenge
United States	CSM + Housing Unit	High (urban districts)	MAPE 3–6%; charter/choice disrupts attendance zones	School choice fragmentation
Canada	CSM + GIS Parcel Data	High (provincial boards)	MAPE 2–5%; strong PISA outcomes correlate with planning fidelity	Rapid immigration settlement patterns
United Kingdom	Pupil Projection Model (PPM)	Moderate	MAPE 2–4%; local authority statutory duty to forecast	Academy / free school competition
Australia	CSM + spatial modelling	High (state govts.)	MAPE 2–5%; large geographic variation; sparse rural data	Urban fringe growth & Indigenous communities
Finland	Municipal planning models	Moderate–High	MAPE 1–3%; declining birth rates; consolidation planning	Rural school viability / linguistic minorities
Japan	Cohort-projection (Ministry)	Moderate	MAPE 1–3%; structural decline; 500+ school closures/yr since 2000	Shrinking populations in regional cities
South Korea	Statistical regression + GIS	High	MAPE 2–4%; rapid urbanization; high-density apartment yield factors	Volatile fertility rate & hyper-competitive schooling
Brazil	Census-based projection	Low–Moderate	MAPE 5–12%; data quality; socio-economic volatility	Infrastructure inequality; data gaps
Sub-Saharan Africa	Population ratio method	Low	MAPE 10–20%; high uncertainty; conflict / displacement	Data scarcity; refugee/displacement flows

Country / Region	Primary Method Used	GIS Adoption Level	Forecast Accuracy / Notes	Key Challenge
China (urban)	Hukou-adjusted CSM	Moderate–High	MAPE 3–7%; internal migration distorts local cohorts	Hukou registration mismatch with the school location

Sources: OECD Education at a Glance (2023); UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2023); Stine & Carrel (2018); NCES (2023). MAPE ranges are illustrative, drawn from published case studies and national reports.

Table 7. Illustrative U.S. K–12 Enrollment Trends by District Typology, 2015–2023 (Student Headcounts)

School District Type	2015	2017	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	% Δ '15–'23
Large Urban (>50K students)	1,240K	1,255K	1,270K	1,198K	1,195K	1,215K	1,230K	−0.8%
Mid-Size Suburban (10–50K)	285K	291K	298K	281K	279K	285K	292K	+2.5%
Small Town / Rural (<10K)	6,820	6,710	6,590	6,400	6,310	6,350	6,420	−5.9%
High-Growth Sun Belt	48,200	51,800	55,100	52,600	54,200	57,900	61,400	+27.4%
Rust Belt Legacy District	72,400	70,100	68,200	63,500	62,800	62,400	61,900	−14.5%

Source: Illustrative data informed by NCES Common Core of Data (2023) and district-level planning reports. Values are representative of national typological patterns.

6.1 United States

The United States presents a highly decentralized context for enrollment forecasting: approximately 13,000 local education agencies (LEAs) operate largely independently, with widely varying analytical capacity. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) publishes annual national and state-level projections using an adapted CSM (NCES, 2023), but the quality of district-level forecasting varies widely.

The proliferation of charter schools, magnet programs, and open-enrollment policies in many states fundamentally complicates attendance-zone-based methods. In cities with aggressive charter expansion, Detroit, Newark, and New Orleans, charter school enrollment has absorbed 30–50% of public-school students, rendering neighborhood-based forecasting models unreliable without explicit modeling of school-choice behavior (NCES, 2023).

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in the steepest single-year enrollment decline in U.S. history (−3.0% between 2019–20 and 2020–21), followed by a partial recovery that was concentrated in suburban and Sun Belt districts rather than large urban centers. As Table 7 illustrates, high-growth Sun Belt districts have demonstrated sustained enrollment increases (+27% over eight years) while Rust Belt legacy districts have lost roughly 15% of enrollment over the same period.

Compounding these cyclical disruptions is a structural demographic headwind: the U.S. general fertility rate declined from 62.5 in 2015 to 54.5 in 2023, a 13% drop, then stabilized at 54.6 in 2024, resulting in approximately 355,000 fewer births annually than the 2015 baseline (Hamilton, Martin, & Osterman, 2025). These smaller birth cohorts will translate into reduced kindergarten entries

through at least the late 2020s, placing long-term downward pressure on enrollment in many districts independent of COVID recovery dynamics or migration patterns. Districts undertaking multi-year capital plans should incorporate local birth certificate data as a leading demographic indicator alongside housing development trends.

6.2 Canada

Canadian school boards operate within provincial frameworks that mandate multi-year enrollment projections as inputs to capital and pupil accommodation planning. The Ontario Ministry of Education's Pupil Accommodation Review (PAR) process requires boards to publish evidence-based Long-Term Capital Plans informed by enrollment projections extending 10 years into the future.

Canadian practice has increasingly adopted GIS-enhanced CSM, particularly in boards managing rapid suburban growth associated with immigration settlement. The combination of a points-based immigration system (generating predictable family composition and settlement location patterns) and granular census data (Statistics Canada's Dissemination Area geography at approximately 400–700 households) makes Canada a methodologically favorable environment for spatially disaggregated forecasting.

6.3 United Kingdom

Local authorities in England have a statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places under the Education Act 1996, which requires annual school capacity surveys and three- to five-year place-planning forecasts. The Department for Education's School Capacity (SCAP) survey collects standardized pupil projection data from all local authorities using the Pupil Projection Model (PPM), a form of CSM adapted to the English year-group structure.

The expansion of academies and free schools since 2010 has introduced a structural complication analogous to that in U.S. charter schools: an increasing share of school-age children attend schools not controlled by the local authority, creating data fragmentation and complicating catchment-based forecasting (Burgess et al., 2019).

6.4 Australia

Australian state and territory governments are responsible for public school planning, with practice varying considerably across jurisdictions. New South Wales and Victoria, which together enroll more than half of Australia's public school students, have developed sophisticated GIS-integrated forecasting systems that combine CSM, housing-yield analysis using state planning data, and spatially disaggregated demographic projections.

A distinctive Australian challenge is the country's geographic scale and the pronounced divide between rapidly growing peri-urban fringe communities (where school overcrowding is endemic) and declining rural and remote communities (where school viability is under pressure). Indigenous community demographic dynamics add complexity, requiring culturally appropriate engagement methods and tailored demographic models (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2021).

6.5 East Asia: Japan and South Korea

Japan and South Korea represent contrasting East Asian cases. Japan faces a structural demographic crisis: a total fertility rate of approximately 1.2 (2022) and sustained net internal migration from rural to urban areas have resulted in the closure of more than 500 schools per year since 2000 (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT], 2023). Japanese municipal governments use cohort-projection models calibrated to city-level population forecasts from the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, which operates within a nationally coordinated framework, distinguishing it from the decentralized U.S. model.

South Korea presents a more volatile context: a fertility rate decline from approximately 1.47 (2000) to 0.78 (2022), the world's lowest, has produced structural enrollment declines in older residential areas, while rapid apartment-complex construction in new urban districts drives temporary local surges.

6.6 Developing Regions

In Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of Latin America, the methodological frontier is less about GIS sophistication than about basic data quality. Population ratio methods, applying school-age population shares from national census data to projected total populations, represent the practical ceiling for most low-income country education ministries. Conflict-driven population displacement, informal settlement growth, and fragile civil registration systems create forecast uncertainty that is qualitatively different from that encountered in OECD contexts.

The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) has documented MAPEs of 10–20% or higher for primary-school enrollment projections in the most data-constrained environments (UNESCO, 2023). International development finance institutions (World Bank, Asian Development Bank) have invested in GIS capacity building in these contexts, but the institutional sustainability of these capabilities remains a challenge.

7. Synthesizing Best Practices and Future Directions

The convergence of evidence from North American, European, East Asian, and developing-country contexts suggests a set of robust best practices for contemporary K–12 enrollment forecasting:

- Hybrid methods are consistently superior to single-method approaches. The combination of CSM for district-level trend continuity with GIS-enhanced spatial disaggregation for school-level accuracy has the strongest evidence base and has been recommended by both the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the Canadian Education Association (CEA).
- Probabilistic output framing should replace single-point projections. Enrollment forecast reports should convey 80th-percentile confidence bands or scenario ranges (low/medium/high growth) to support risk-informed capital decisions. This is particularly important in the post-COVID environment, where demographic uncertainty has increased.

- Annual recalibration is essential. All methods degrade in accuracy as the forecast horizon extends, and all are sensitive to assumption drift. Operational forecasting systems should be recalibrated annually using new enrollment and demographic data.
- Equity analysis should be embedded in the forecasting process. GIS-based demographic analysis should not be limited to student-count projections; it should systematically assess the equity implications of capacity allocation and attendance-zone design.
- Open-source and cloud-based platforms are reducing the technology barrier. QGIS, R, Python (GeoPandas, Scikit-learn), and cloud-based ArcGIS Online substantially reduce the software cost that previously constrained smaller districts.
- Data partnerships with municipal governments (housing permit databases, parcel data, transportation demand models) are increasingly important as the primary drivers of enrollment change migrate from birth-rate trends to residential development patterns.
- Birth certificate data should be integrated as a leading demographic indicator. Because kindergarten cohorts enter school five to six years after birth, county- or district-level vital statistics data from state health agencies provide a five-year-in-advance signal of future enrollment demand that is far more reliable than extrapolating from recent enrollment ratios. Between 2015 and 2024, the U.S. general fertility rate declined from 62.5 to 54.6 per 1,000 females aged 15–44, resulting in approximately 355,000 fewer annual births than at the 2015 baseline (Hamilton, Martin, & Osterman, 2025). Districts in regions mirroring the national trend should recalibrate kindergarten entry projections using current local birth data, rather than perpetuating assumptions derived from a higher-fertility period.

The most pressing frontier challenges include: (1) the integration of school-choice and charter-school market-share modeling into spatially explicit forecasting frameworks; (2) the development of forecasting tools that adequately capture the enrollment impacts of climate-driven migration; and (3) the application of transfer learning from data-rich to data-poor district contexts to reduce geographic inequality in forecasting capacity.

8. Conclusion

K–12 enrollment forecasting has evolved from simple extrapolative arithmetic into a sophisticated interdisciplinary field drawing on demography, spatial analysis, econometrics, and machine learning. The cohort-survival method remains the practitioner's workhorse — transparent, trusted, and sufficiently accurate in stable demographic environments — but its limitations under conditions of rapid demographic change or structural disruption are well documented. GIS-based spatial analysis has emerged as the most impactful methodological enhancement, consistently reducing forecast error at the school and attendance-zone level where capital planning decisions are made.

International comparisons reveal that the most accurate, equitable, and operationally sustainable forecasting systems share three characteristics: they are spatially granular, probabilistically framed, and embedded within data governance structures that ensure annual recalibration using

high-quality demographic and housing inputs. The United States lags behind Canada, the United Kingdom, and several East Asian jurisdictions in the degree of methodological standardization and data sharing that enable these characteristics to be achieved at scale.

Practitioners and policymakers would benefit from sustained investment in: staff capacity in GIS and data analytics; open data partnerships with municipal governments; probabilistic forecast frameworks that explicitly communicate planning uncertainty; and equity-centered analytical approaches that make demographic justice a first-order planning goal alongside enrollment accuracy.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2021). Schools Australia 2021. ABS. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/education/schools-australia/latest-release

Burgess, S., Greaves, E., & Vignoles, A. (2019). School choice in England: Evidence from national administrative data. Oxford Review of Education, 45(5), 690–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2019.1604332

Caldas, S. J., & Bankston, C. L. (1997). Effect of school population socioeconomic status on individual academic achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 90(5), 269–277.

Forrester, J. W. (1961). Industrial dynamics. MIT Press.

Gelman, A., & Hill, J. (2007). Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models. Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, B. E., Martin, J. A., & Osterman, M. J. K. (2025). Births: Provisional data for 2024. Vital Statistics Rapid Release, Report No. 38. National Center for Health Statistics. https://doi.org/10.15620/cdc/174587

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1992). A demographic look at tomorrow. Institute for Educational Leadership.

Lowry, I. S. (1964). A model of metropolis. RAND Corporation Memorandum RM-4035-RC.

Lundberg, S. M., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30. NeurIPS.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology [MEXT]. (2023). Statistical abstract of education, culture, sports, science and technology: 2023 edition. Government of Japan.

Murdock, S. H., & Ellis, D. R. (1991). Applied demography: An introduction to basic concepts, methods, and data. Westview Press.

National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2022). Impact of the coronavirus pandemic on elementary and secondary education. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/tca

National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2023). Common Core of Data (CCD). U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/

National Center for Education Statistics [NCES]. (2023). Projections of education statistics to 2031 (NCES 2023-013). U.S. Department of Education.

OECD. (2023). Education at a glance 2023: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/e13bef63-en

Osterman, M. J. K., Hamilton, B. E., Martin, J. A., Driscoll, A. K., & Valenzuela, C. P. (2024). Births: Final data for 2022. National Vital Statistics Reports, 73(2). National Center for Health Statistics. https://doi.org/10.15620/cdc:145588

Richards, M. P. (2014). The gerrymandering of school attendance zones and the segregation of public schools: A geospatial analysis. American Educational Research Journal, 51(6), 1119–1157.

Stine, R., & Carrel, A. (2018). Forecasting enrollment in the age of school choice: A practitioner's guide. American School Board Journal, 205(4), 22–27.

Tanner, C. K., & Lackney, J. A. (2006). Educational facilities planning: Leadership, architecture, and management. Allyn & Bacon.

Theobald, D. M. (2003). GIS concepts and ArcGIS methods (2nd ed.). Conservation Planning Technologies.

Tompkins, R. (2000). Using student generation rates to improve school capacity planning. School Planning & Management, 39(4), 14–18.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2023). Education data in crisis-affected contexts. UNESCO-UIS. https://uis.unesco.org