



Marge Thiesse  
Martin Luther High School  
Northrop, MN  
June 20, 2012



Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey  
Version 3.0  
Final Report

# Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey

## Version 3.0

### Table of Contents

Table of Contents			
		Satisfaction Quadrants	61
		Understanding the Satisfaction Quadrants	62
Overview of the Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey, Version 2.0	3	Quadrant Report	63
Crosstabs	22	Differentials	64
Understanding Crosstabs	23	Understanding the Differential Report	65
Crosstabs Legend	27	Differentials in Difference Order	66
Crosstabs Report	29	Differentials in Importance Order	67
Student Crosstabs	36	Differentials in Effectiveness Order	68
		Special Differential Section	69
Subgroups	39	Close Correlates	71
Understanding Subgroups	40	Understanding Close Correlates	72
Subgroups Report	42	Close Correlate Tables	73
Leverage	46	Appendices	77
Understanding Leverage	47	What Do I Do Now?	78
Leverage Report	49	Word of Mouth Calendar	81
		Understanding Promoters, Passives, Detractors	98



## Overview

An overview of the Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey, Version 3.0. This is the same summary you may have received before ordering the survey.

## GraceWorks' Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey Version 3.0: At a Glance

GraceWorks' Parent Satisfaction and Referral survey (PSRS) is the only annual survey your Christian school will need. Based on research with nearly 400 Christian schools and over 70,000 Christian school constituents, the PSRS provides all of the following:

(1) **Normed data** – Percentile ranks for satisfaction and willingness to refer for:

Your school as a whole AND all relevant demographics:

Age	Educational attainment
Race	Grade of child
Gender	Relationship to school
Income	Distance from school

(2) **Comparisons within Subgroups** – discovering statistically significant differences in satisfaction and willingness to refer within each demographic above (e.g. Baby Boomers vs. Generation X.)

(3) **Lists of Promoters, Detractors, Passives,**

(4) **Lists of volunteers** willing to help you with marketing tasks,

(5) **Ample testimonial material,**

(6) **Leads from Promoters** of other families to recruit,

(7) **Explanation of Detractor and Passive problems**, in respondents own words,

(8) **Suggestions for improvement** from all respondents,

(9) **Re-enrollment status for next school year** with other schools considered, and why.

(10) **Overall evaluation and comments of students** (optional).

(11) **Quality Gaps:** Importance and effectiveness comparison of the 40 program elements most related to satisfaction and willingness to refer.

(12) **Thrill me / Disgust me / Annoy me / Frill me** program element tables for your school as a whole.

(13) **Close correlates of each programmatic element** – understanding which elements relate to other elements, in the minds of your parents.

(14) **Effect size ratings and statistical significance tests** for all demographics and program elements.

(15) **Leverage ratings** to prioritize what program improvements are most likely to increase satisfaction and willingness to refer.

(16) **Percentile ranks of program elements effectiveness** – If any program element is problematic, understand how you rate *in that item* compared to other Christian schools.

(17) **Detailed explanation** of what to do next, including a month-by-month calendar of word of mouth activities.

PSRS 3.0 takes 15 – 20 minutes to complete through a simple online process. From start to finish, the PSRS process takes about 6 weeks from engagement to report.

PSRS 3.0 is the foundational diagnostic tool required for all GraceWorks' coaching clients, as well as seminar recipients. Our best creative thinking over five years went into the development of this survey.

Confidentiality Note: GraceWorks does not track names or any other identifying information from respondents. Individual schools track who received each “token” (identifying number). Respondents can choose to remain anonymous (with the common-sense exception of token numbers for respondents who volunteered ) via a final question, in which case token numbers are not reported back.

## Overall Rationale: PSRS 3.0

The Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey (Version 3.0) helps you fulfill two mandates:

The Biblical Mandate – God calls all of us to excellence (Ecclesiastes 9:10, Colossians 3:23-24). PSRS 3.0 provides you a valuable opportunity to “see yourself as others see you.”

The Practical Mandate – Between 60-70% of all new families to a Christian school come from word of mouth (WOM) referral. WOM leads are both easiest to close (enroll) and, importantly, least price sensitive.

In fact, GraceWorks’ research clearly shows that Promoters (individuals who make referrals to your school) are:

- More likely to volunteer,
- Also less price sensitive,
- More apt to otherwise participate, and
- More likely to donate ... all in multiples of 300% or more.

There are two basic methods to increase word of mouth referrals:

- (1) Encourage Promoters to make more referrals, and
- (2) Improve program quality, in the right areas, to create more Promoters – and Promoter enthusiasm.

The PSRS (3.0) helps you accomplish both.

### Encouraging Promoters to Make More Referrals

The first practical step is to identify who makes referrals to your school. A pivotal question is Fred Reichheld’s “Ultimate Question,” from his excellent 2006 book on the same:

On a scale of 0 to 10, with 10 being high, how likely are you to refer a friend or colleague to our school?

Through four decades of customer satisfaction research, Reichheld found that 90% of WOM to any enterprise comes from individuals who respond to this question with a “9” or “10”.

Once Promoters are known, you can work with them via our proven WOM strategies, detailed in a month-by-month calendar. The goal is to increase the number of referrals made (e.g. using Promoter receptions), and increase the quality of the referral. (e.g. “Don’t just tell the new family, tell us about the new family.”)

### Improve Overall Program Quality

From the point of view of satisfaction and willingness to refer, not all program improvements are equal in effectiveness. A key goal of the Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey is to help you understand what program improvements are most likely to increase overall satisfaction. This is done through the differentials, the Thrill me / Disgust me / Annoy me / Frill me tables, and through the Leverage analysis.

As part of our “8 Habits of Highly Satisfying Christian Schools” research, we have confirmed the educational literature’s tenet that teacher-related items explain 40-45% of parents (and often, other constituents) view of satisfaction with a Christian school. In a large multi-school denominational study in 2010, “Teachers work well with parents” turned out to be the highest leverage item of 40 items tested, with another three (“Engaging teaching,” “Academically Competent teachers,” “Teachers exhibit care and concern for students) in the top ten. (n = 750.)

In a Christian school, the leadership challenge is to determine what program improvements are the highest priority. While ultimately overall vision and God’s purpose trump all other considerations, it is quite helpful to know what program improvements are most likely to increase parental satisfaction, and thereby increase parental (and other constituent) word of mouth referrals.

It is important to note that overall parental satisfaction is highly correlated (.70+) with willingness to refer. We find very few and very small program quality gaps in schools with satisfaction in the 80<sup>th</sup>

percentile and above, typically averaging, *for all program elements*, no more than ¼ of one point on a 5 point scale. (Quality gap is defined as the average of all responses on all importance ratings less the average of all responses on all effectiveness ratings.) In fact, in highly satisfying schools, we typically find no more than a handful of individual program elements with a quality gap of .50 or above. (Thus, .50+ quality gaps are a good “rule of thumb” for defining a “problem.”)

This finding confirms Peter Drucker’s view that organizational excellence is consistent program quality across all program elements. The PSRS’s identification of “Disgust me” items is particularly helpful in this regard. To determine Thrill me / Disgust me / Annoy me / Frill me program elements, GraceWorks uses a sophisticated formula which considers both the relative importance and effectiveness of each program element in standard deviation units, which we call the “zDif” score.

On the other hand, average quality gaps for all program elements in schools with low satisfaction ratings can average above one point on a five point scale. Even here, the challenge is the same; to present Administrators the highest payoff, the highest leverage, program elements improvements – those improvements which are most likely to improve constituent satisfaction and willingness to refer.

To better understand problematic program elements, PSRS 3.0 includes both “close correlates” and percentile ranks of program element effectiveness. At the time of this writing (December 2011), comparison data for the program effectiveness items is based on results from about 60 Christian schools. We expect well over 100 by the end of the 2011-2012 school year.

### **The Importance of Qualitative Data**

*“There are lies, damn lies, and there are statistics.”* Mark Twain

In working closely with several hundred Christian schools, we have learned that Mark Twain’s view of statistics is alive and well, particularly among teachers. Although we have spent countless hours getting the statistics of the PSRS right, for many people, there is simply no substitute for qualitative data.

GraceWorks Ministries

Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey (Ver. 3.0), © 2011-12

For that reason, the longest section of the PSRS report continues to be the qualitative comments of all respondents. In addition to asking all respondents for suggestions for improvement, we also ask the follow-up questions (to the referral question) suggested by Fred Reichheld:

#### Promoters

What are the reasons you rated us so highly?

#### Passives

What could we do for you to rate us closer to 10?

#### Detractors

What problem are you having (or did you have) with our school, and how can we fix it?

The answers to these questions are sorted by both satisfaction / willingness to refer, and by subgroup. This gives our clients an organized way to gather more detail for subgroups that are above or below average, adding important “color” to “black and white” statistics. In our hands-on experience, this “color” is often vital to “selling” the need for change to school teachers and other staff.

### **Mobilizing Marketing Volunteers**

Administrators and Principals are consistently surprised by the number and skills of volunteers who offer to help market the school. It is certainly true that volunteers do not volunteer because “they are not asked.” Our survey research shows, over and over again, that they are not asked *because they are not known*. In other words, the same 20% keep doing all the work because we know them well enough to ask them.

With the PSRS, we are able to ask every (adult) survey respondent. This gives you a much broader pool of potential volunteers, along with a good understanding of how they want to help.

## Understanding Priorities for Improvement

One of the biggest frustrations of the average Administrator is the plethora of program elements that could – or should – be improved, and knowing the relative priority of each.

While constituent satisfaction cannot be the only consideration for determining the priority of program improvements, it is closely correlated with willingness to refer, willingness to volunteer, and willingness to donate.

The PSRS provides concrete, specific help in determining priorities for improvement. In the PSRS, this is accomplished in five powerful ways:

- (1) **Leverage** – a listing of program elements according to their relative correlation on satisfaction and willingness to refer. This tells you, at a glance, which program improvements will improve satisfaction and willingness to refer the most.
- (2) **Differentials** – the average importance and effectiveness of all program elements. GraceWorks defines quality gaps as the difference between the two.
- (3) **Thrill me / Frill me / Disgust me / Annoy me** – from the perspective of word of mouth and willingness to refer, understanding which program elements Thrill / Frill / Disgust, and Annoy your constituents. This is reported to you school as a whole, and for every statistically significant subgroup over 30 with moderate to high effect size differences in satisfaction and willingness to refer.
- (4) **Percentile ranks of all program elements** – which compare your effectiveness scores for items such as “engaging teaching” with effectiveness scores of other Christian schools. The result of the comparison is reported as a percentile rank.

**Close Correlates** – Typically effectiveness ratings of key items are “clustered” in the minds of your parents. Close correlates give you a

solid idea of what clusters need attention, such as overall teacher effectiveness, leadership, communication, academics, and the like.

## Predict the Satisfaction Impact of Large Expenditures

Since 2007, GraceWorks’ PSRS has helped schools understand the relative satisfaction boasts that can be expected by large expenditures, such as adding a gym, or a foreign language. This is done by “cross-tabbing” satisfaction and willingness to refer of individuals who would benefit by the new expenditure, and comparing their satisfaction to individuals who would not.

Crassly (but in plain English), you could ask parents:

*Is your child a jock?*

With the answer to that simple question, we now know who the parents of jocks are, and parents of “non-jocks.” Thinking about that from a satisfaction point of view, if the new gym really mattered, we would expect parents of jocks to be less satisfied than parents of non-jocks. If that difference is large (determined with effect sizes) and statistically significant (determined with two different F-tests), then it is a good bet that adding a gym will significantly increase satisfaction (which would result in more referrals, more donations, and more volunteering.)

There are two important caveats here. (1) It is NOT a given at all that parents of jocks will be less satisfied. We have seen it both ways. If satisfaction between jock and non-jock parents is roughly equal, the lack of a new gym is not significantly depressing parental satisfaction and willingness to refer your school. (If you build a new gym, they may NOT come.) (2) Why this ultimately matters is that our research clearly shows that a host of other program elements (teachers, Christian character development) are typically far more important in determining parental satisfaction.

In other words, before spending big money on a new building, or a brand new program, it would be wise to see if the absence of that building, or that program, is dissatisfying to the parents and students who care about it the most.

In fact, many other aspects of your program can be evaluated the same way. An optional PSRS question is “Strengths of your child,” where we ask parents what academic subjects at which their children excel. If parents of children good at math are much less satisfied, it is possible the math program or curriculum is not strong enough. Non-curricular aspects of your program can be tested the same way (e.g. how satisfied are parents whose children are good at music, or evangelism?)

### **The Bottom Line**

Between 60% and 70% of new parent families come from word of mouth referral. GraceWorks’ Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey provides you solid guidance on how to increase overall satisfaction and word of mouth referrals. It is the foundational survey for all GraceWorks’ clients.

### **Thus, the PSRS Can Help You Answer Questions Like These:**

- Who are our Promoters, Detractors, and Passives?
- What is the satisfaction/willingness to refer of parents at various grade levels? (What could we do to avoid losing parents after grade \_\_\_? What are the concerns of parents in our middle school?)
- How effectively are we meeting the needs of Generation X compared to Baby Boomers?
- How can we more effectively reach Hispanics? (African-American? Asians?)
- By studying the responses of our affluent parents, what can we learn about attracting more affluent people to our school?
- How could we reach our immediate neighborhood better?
- What is the relative satisfaction of our staff compared to our

parents? (Current parents to past parents? Church members to parents?)

- What program elements are the highest priority to improve?
- What program elements are most satisfying?
- What program elements are most disgusting?
- What program elements do not help satisfaction one way or another?
- What are the WOM messages Promoters and Detractors are likely to say?
- What do students themselves say about the school?
- In helping market the school, who is:
  - ...Willing to represent the school at their church?
  - ... Help with all the writing chores?
  - ... Distribute marketing materials around town?
  - ... Lead marketing events (e.g. Promoter’s receptions)?
  - ... Do the work for marketing events?
  - ... Help with online marketing?
  - ... Do graphic art?
  - ... Serve on a Speaker’s bureau?
  - ... Serve on a marketing taskforce?
- What improvements are likely to increase the number of Promoters?
- Who are our Detractors, and how can we fix their problem?
- What are our largest quality gaps for the school as a whole, and key subgroups?



- What other schools are parents considering, and why?
- What is the re-enrollment status of all responding parents?
- In parents' minds, how does our school compare to other schools parents are considering?
- What are the key concerns of the various racial groups that attend our school?
- How can we reach higher income families more effectively?
- If we build a new gym, is it likely to increase overall satisfaction, and willingness to refer, of current parents?
- What are the suggestions for improvement of all respondents, as well as for each subgroup?
- What program element effectiveness scores most closely relate to each other?
- What program elements are highly effective compared to effectiveness scores of the same element in Christian schools throughout North America?

# Understanding the PSRS: Crosstabs

Broken down group by group

Willingness to refer in one number

Overall satisfaction in one number

Red indicates statistical significance

Effect size for each subgroup

Percentile rankings for each group

Two separate databases for willingness to refer and satisfaction

Certain questions tested for parents alone (income / education)

Sub-totals with corresponding percents for questions not asked of all

Raw Numbers for all groups

Follows census categories where possible

All other demographic questions and other custom questions are cross-tabbed the same way

Cross Tabs		Net Referral Score 33					Net Referral Score 47					Net Referral Score			Net Satisfaction Score		
Example Christian School		Closing Date: 6/25/2010					Total Responses 750										
Question	Ave Imp Leverage	Answer	Referral	ANOVA	Percentile	Effect	Satisfaction	ANOVA	Percentile	Effect	Response % Resp	Promoters	Passives	Detractors	Advocates	Apathetics	Assessing
Survey as a whole		Example Christian School	33		23%		47		13%		750 100%	423	154	173	486	133	131
Gender		Male	41	N (.565)	69%	0.02	52	N (.433)	74%	0.23	387 52%	213	119	55	267	54	66
Gender		Female	28	N (.250)	59%	-0.01	71	N (.300)	59%	-0.11	363 48%	199	67	97	284	51	28
Relationship to School		Current Parent or Guardian	36	Y (.009)	12%	0.05	49	N (.067)	11%	0.03	590 79%	341	121	128	385	109	96
Relationship to School		Past Parent	11	Y (.018)	3%	-0.55	32	N (.248)	7%	-0.13	74 10%	32	18	24	44	10	20
Relationship to School		School board	42	N (.338)	17%	0.06	48	N (.751)	9%	-0.01	168 22%	104	30	34	107	35	26
Relationship to School		Member of Sponsoring Church	56	Y (.000)	32%	0.26	62	Y (.000)	36%	0.21	209 28%	146	35	28	152	35	22
Relationship to School		Teacher or Other Staff	49	Y (.003)	31%	0.20	55	N (.061)	21%	0.11	173 23%	113	31	29	120	29	24
Relationship to School		Alumni	57	Y (.002)	54%	0.34	65	Y (.016)	42%	0.22	94 13%	65	18	11	70	15	9
Relationship to School		Current Student	53	N (.114)	50%	0.28	67	N (.291)	45%	0.17	30 4%	20	6	4	23	4	3
Relationship to School		Volunteer - Leader (besides School Board)	100	Y (.004)	67%	0.76	100	Y (.015)	63%	0.65	14 2%	14	0	0	14	0	0
Relationship to School		Volunteer - Other	81	Y (.000)	64%	0.50	81	Y (.000)	57%	0.42	85 11%	73	8	4	74	6	5
Relationship to School		Grandparent	42	Y (.002)	45%	-0.28	33	Y (.045)	33%	-0.37	43 6%	25	11	7	25	7	11
Relationship to School		Donor	50	Y (.018)	23%	0.55	66	Y (.037)	48%	0.47	212 28%	137	45	30	161	30	21
Household Income		\$25,000 to \$34,999	73	N (.305)	47%	0.18	77	N (.112)	45%	0.07	22 4%	17	4	1	18	3	1
Household Income		\$35,000 to \$49,999	77	Y (.000)	57%	0.61	88	N (.059)	63%	0.55	26 4%	21	4	1	23	3	0
Household Income		\$50,000 to \$74,999	47	Y (.047)	26%	-0.29	56	Y (.013)	60%	-0.26	139 24%	90	25	24	93	31	15
Household Income		\$75,000 to \$99,999	65	N (.325)	46%	0.27	58	N (.654)	51%	0.31	155 26%	115	25	15	106	33	16
Household Income		\$100,000 to \$149,999	53	N (.419)	35%	-0.08	61	Y (.010)	33%	-0.11	122 21%	81	25	16	90	17	15
Household Income		\$150,000 to \$199,999	38	Y (.002)	32%	-0.45	34	Y (.032)	29%	-0.57	61 10%	32	20	9	31	20	10
Household Income		\$200,000+	33	Y (.003)	28%	-0.66	44	Y (.015)	23%	-0.77	55 9%	31	11	13	32	15	8
Household Income		No Answer	60				70				10 2%	7	2	1	7	3	0
		Totals: Household Income									590 100%						
Child's Grade		Preschool	83	N (.855)	54%	0.33	87	N (.409)	51%	0.19	46 6%	38	8	0	41	4	1
Child's Grade		Kindergarten	79	N (.563)	45%	0.29	81	N (.944)	38%	0.25	43 6%	34	9	0	37	4	2
Child's Grade		1st	59	N (.340)	30%	0.19	63	N (.909)	28%	0.15	41 5%	30	5	6	31	5	5
Child's Grade		2nd	55	N (.447)	25%	0.09	68	Y (.038)	27%	0.14	47 6%	31	11	5	35	9	3
Child's Grade		3rd	59	N (.138)	18%	0.02	61	N (.389)	82%	0.01	44 6%	32	6	6	32	7	5
Child's Grade		4th	57	Y (.002)	10%	-0.21	55	Y (.009)	7%	-0.25	56 7%	41	6	9	39	9	8
Child's Grade		5th	45	N (.253)	5%	0.29	47	N (.085)	33%	0.35	53 7%	33	11	9	35	8	10
Child's Grade		6th	41	N (.119)	11%	0.21	46	Y (.034)	82%	0.19	41 5%	24	10	7	26	8	7
Child's Grade		7th	42	N (.724)	18%	0.22	49	N (.538)	60%	0.18	43 6%	27	7	9	28	8	7
Child's Grade		8th	26	Y (.015)	8%	-0.25	36	Y (.009)	15%	-0.30	47 6%	22	15	10	26	12	9
Child's Grade		9th	34	Y (.049)	20%	-0.19	44	N (.102)	18%	-0.25	32 4%	18	7	7	20	6	6
Child's Grade		10th	42	N (.344)	21%	-0.03	45	N (.409)	17%	-0.01	31 4%	19	6	6	19	7	5
Child's Grade		11th	45	N (.581)	17%	0.07	52	N (.289)	24%	0.13	29 4%	18	6	5	19	6	4
Child's Grade		12th	27	Y (.035)	12%	-0.39	35	Y (.041)	19%	-0.35	37 5%	18	11	8	20	10	7
		Totals: Children's Grades									590						

## Understanding the PSRS: Crosstabs, cont.

By cross-tabbing satisfaction scores with effectiveness ratings, we are able to determine which program elements impact satisfaction the most.

Effectiveness scale is 1 to 5, with 5 being highly effective

Effect sizes here can be quite dramatic and telling

Final variables are being determined with factor analysis

This is the leverage score, which indicates the relative impact on satisfaction and willingness to refer

Clients are allowed to change some factors at n/c

Importance ratings are included as well (1 to 5, 5 is high)

Cross Tabs		Net Referral Score 33					Net Referral Score 47							Net Referral Score			Net Satisfaction Score		
Example Christian School		Closing Date:		6/25/2010		Total Responses		750				Net Referral Score			Net Satisfaction Score				
Question	Ave Imp Leverage	Answer	Referral	ANOVA	Percentile	Effect	Satisfaction	ANOVA	Percentile	Effect	response:	% Resp	Promoters	Passives	Detractors	Advocates	Apathetics	Assassins	
Academically competent teachers	4.83	N/A	23	Y (.000)		-0.65	-13	Y (.000)		-0.66	56	7%	16	11	29	18	13	25	
Academically competent teachers		1 or 2	-69	Y (.000)		-1.41	-77	Y (.000)		-1.60	35	5%	5	1	29	1	6	28	
Academically competent teachers		3	-38	Y (.000)		-0.77	-22	Y (.000)		-0.82	87	12%	15	24	48	17	34	36	
Academically competent teachers	642	5 or 4	56	Y (.000)		0.27	71	Y (.000)		0.29	572	76%	387	118	67	450	80	42	
Administrative leadership	4.61	N/A	-24	Y (.000)		-0.69	-10	Y (.000)		-0.67	68	9%	18	16	34	22	17	29	
Administrative leadership		1 or 2	-38	Y (.000)		-0.93	-20	Y (.000)		-0.95	91	12%	17	22	52	21	31	39	
Administrative leadership		3	5	Y (.001)		-0.30	17	Y (.000)		-0.38	109	15%	43	28	38	49	29	31	
Administrative leadership	594	5 or 4	61	Y (.000)		0.34	75	Y (.000)		0.36	482	64%	345	88	49	394	56	32	
Denominational beliefs integrated into the educational program	4.54	N/A	-4	Y (.000)		-0.48	6	Y (.000)		-0.48	72	10%	26	17	29	27	22	23	
Denominational beliefs integrated into the educational program		1 or 2	-46	Y (.000)		-1.22	-52	Y (.000)		-1.35	50	7%	9	9	32	6	12	32	
Denominational beliefs integrated into the educational program		3	4	Y (.000)		-0.28	25	Y (.000)		-0.31	125	17%	48	34	43	61	34	30	
Denominational beliefs integrated into the educational program	584	5 or 4	54	Y (.000)		0.26	69	Y (.000)		0.28	503	67%	340	94	69	392	65	46	
Challenging educational program	4.6	N/A	-6	Y (.000)		-0.50	-3	Y (.000)		-0.56	67	9%	24	15	28	23	19	25	
Challenging educational program		1 or 2	-61	Y (.000)		-1.18	-46	Y (.000)		-1.17	54	7%	5	11	38	6	17	31	
Challenging educational program		3	-8	Y (.000)		-0.45	14	Y (.000)		-0.44	110	15%	35	31	44	47	31	32	
Challenging educational program	597	5 or 4	57	Y (.000)		0.28	71	Y (.000)		0.29	519	69%	359	97	63	410	66	43	
Christian character development	4.82	N/A	-3	Y (.000)		-0.44	0	Y (.000)		-0.51	58	8%	21	14	23	21	16	21	
Christian character development		1 or 2	-56	Y (.000)		-1.33	-50	Y (.000)		-1.36	68	9%	10	10	48	13	8	47	
Christian character development		3	-12	Y (.000)		-0.40	15	Y (.000)		-0.42	119	16%	33	39	47	50	37	32	
Christian character development	649	5 or 4	60	Y (.000)		0.32	73	Y (.000)		0.34	505	67%	359	91	55	402	72	31	

## Understanding the PSRS: Leverage Score

### Program Elements by Leverage Score

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
1	Engaging teaching	760	0.70	Disgust	23	4.69	3.99
2	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	736	0.68	Disgust	23	4.50	3.82
3	Teachers are Christian role models	720	0.53		11	4.72	4.19
4	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	715	0.72	Disgust	11	4.71	3.99
5	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	706	0.53		14	4.76	4.23
6	Principal leadership	697	0.62	Disgust	21	4.54	3.93
7	Safe learning environment	697	0.46	Thrill	7	4.77	4.30
8	Christian environment	690	0.45	Thrill	18	4.67	4.22
9	Qualifications of teachers	669	0.65	Disgust	18	4.67	4.02
10	Teachers work well with parents	668	0.45	Frill	23	4.47	4.02

The Leverage scoring introduced in PSRS 2.0 has been substantially improved in 3.0. Instead of reporting the score itself, PSRS 3.0 adds several other scores for each program element, including:

- (1) The difference (quality gap) scores,
- (2) Quadrant ranking (Thrill / Frill / Disgust / Annoy),
- (3) Percentile rank of effectiveness score for each item
- (4) Average importance rating, and
- (5) Average effectiveness rating.

With this report, it is easier than ever to determine what program elements need work. (In the example above, all the “Disgust me” items need immediate improvement, because of their high leverage scores.)

Leverage is a 1000-point scale which indicates what program elements are most impacting satisfaction and willingness to refer. (1000 is high, 0 is low, and the impact can be positive or negative. For the school above, “Engaging teaching” is a high leverage item that is negatively impacting satisfaction, while “Christian environment” is positively impacting satisfaction and willingness to refer. (The low percentile rankings of this school, even for “Thrill me” items, indicates highly discerning parents here.)

The leverage score itself is based on five different elements:

- (1) Relative importance of the item,
- (2) Difference in satisfaction and willingness to refer with respondents’ effectiveness rating for the program item,
- (3) Effect sizes (on satisfaction and willingness to refer) of high or low effectiveness ratings for this program element,
- (4) Consistency of effectiveness ratings and satisfaction scores for that item, and
- (5) The overall range of respondents rating the program element from highly effective to poorly done.

The purpose of the leverage rating is to understand which program element improvements are likely to increase satisfaction and willingness to refer the most.

In the case of the school above, items 1, 2, 4, 6, and 9 are the most pressing items for improvement (out of over 40 tested.) These program elements have high leverage scores, and relatively large quality gaps.

Note that in the Advanced PSRS, *you can add your program elements, which will be all scored as the above*, with the exception of percentile ranks (because no comparison data will exist.)

## Understanding PSRS 3.0: Differentials

Differentials were previously only available in our Differential Diagnostic reports. We are now making them a standard part of our Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey. These are often the most teacher-friendly statistics.

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.33	Financial stability of school	3.54	0.79	1.36
4.53	Key life skills are taught (e.g. value of work)	3.66	0.87	1.34
4.73	High behavioral standards for students	3.79	0.94	1.30
4.06	Students are taught to witness	3.44	0.61	1.03
4.46	Staffing is adequate	3.68	0.77	1.02
4.24	School's communication with constituents	3.61	0.64	0.78
4.82	Christian character development	3.96	0.85	0.73
4.61	Administrative leadership	3.88	0.73	0.56
4.77	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	4.00	0.77	0.43
4.19	Reasonable tuition	3.66	0.53	0.40

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.52	Educational vision for the school	3.86	0.66	0.39
4.08	Individual student differences are accommodated	3.60	0.48	0.39
4.26	Staff is customer-service oriented	3.74	0.52	0.23
4.73	Positive school climate	4.02	0.70	0.20
4.35	Students feel accepted by their peers	3.80	0.55	0.18
4.61	Teachers work well with parents	3.97	0.65	0.15
4.60	Challenging educational program	3.97	0.63	0.11
4.04	Students are involved in their church	3.63	0.40	0.08
4.42	School's use of resources	3.87	0.56	0.08
3.81	Significant financial aid available	3.52	0.30	0.00

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.71	Engaging teaching	4.06	0.65	-0.02
4.66	High academic standards for students	4.03	0.62	-0.05
4.58	Individual attention provided for students	3.99	0.59	-0.06
4.11	Student admission standards	3.72	0.39	-0.09
3.41	School accommodates homeschoolers	3.31	0.10	-0.16
4.47	School partners with parents	3.95	0.52	-0.18
4.46	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	3.95	0.51	-0.19
4.54	Adventist beliefs integrated into the educational program	4.00	0.53	-0.23
4.83	Academically competent teachers	4.19	0.63	-0.31
4.37	School compares well to other educational options	3.93	0.45	-0.34

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.51	Curriculum is up-to-date	4.01	0.50	-0.35
4.35	Pastor's support of the school	3.94	0.41	-0.46
4.14	Use of technology in instruction	3.82	0.33	-0.47
4.50	Facility allows for an adequate learning environment	4.08	0.42	-0.71
4.83	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	4.29	0.54	-0.75
3.86	Variety of extra-curriculars	3.72	0.14	-0.83
4.70	Safe learning environment	4.26	0.44	-0.99
3.92	Quality of parents	3.84	0.08	-1.22
3.97	School advances denominational goals	3.88	0.08	-1.28
3.35	Convenient compared to other educational options	3.69	-0.34	-2.11

Differentials report the average importance and effective for each item. The difference between the 2 (DIF) is the quality gap. zDIF reports the quality gap in standard deviation units.

## Understanding the PSRS 3.0: Thrill Me / Disgust Me / Annoy Me / Frill Me

Based on our Differential Diagnostic work, we have developed very precise rules, over several years of experience, to determine what factors Delight or Disgust your constituents.

New in PSRS 3.0, your final report includes the leverage score and the difference (quality gap) score. This is also a relatively easy chart for teachers to understand, although the findings can sometime be tough to take.

A real school is reported here. The “Disgust Me” list on the left would be far more important to “fix” than the “Disgust Me” list on the right. That is determined by the three-digit leverage score (where 1000 is high). Based on the report alone, we would not view facilities renovation as a high priority compared to the left-most items, again because of the significantly lower leverage score. (Note, the decimal number is the quality gap score, which is the difference of average importance and average effectiveness for each item. The scale is 1 to 5, with five being high.)

Program elements are assigned based on their relative importance and quality gap scores. Note that no “Annoy me” or “Disgust me” element can have a quality gap score less than .50. Likewise, no

program element can be a “Thrill me” or “Frill me” if the quality gap score is greater than .50.

Based on these rules, not all program elements can be accurately

placed on this chart. Essentially, some elements are “average” items that do not stand out one way or another.

In the advanced survey, your program elements are scored with the standard elements, and many will end up on this chart.

(Note that sometimes the statistics do, in fact, lie. The first two items on the Frill me list here are more than Frills. The first is close to being a problem. The second is a reason parents choose the school. This is why GraceWorks’ President, Dan Krause, interprets each survey in an hour-

long phone appointment.)

**Program Elements Table**

*Fix the “Disgust Me” factors first, and keep improving the “Thrill Me” elements. Do something with the “Annoy Me” elements, if you can. Find a volunteer for the “Frill Me.”*

**Very Important to Parents**

Done Poorly (Ineffectively)	<b>Disgust Me</b> <i>Fail to fix these and create <b>Detractors</b></i>	<b>Thrill Me</b> <i>Do well here to create <b>Promoters</b></i>		
	Engaging teaching (760, 0.7) Principal provides staff oversight/ accountability (736, 0.68) Students well-prepared for next educational level (715, 0.72) Principal leadership (697, 0.62) Qualifications of teachers (669, 0.65) Academically competent teachers (657, 0.69)	Key life skills taught (632, 0.6) Individual student attention provided (502, 0.68) Facility allows for adequate learning environment (467, 0.68) Financial stability of school (425, 0.57) Educational objectives clear (411, 0.62) Reasonable tuition (393, 0.81)	Safe learning environment (697, 0.46) Religion curriculum (485, 0.32) Christian environment (690, 0.45)	
	<b>Annoy Me</b> <i>Enough of these will turn perfectly good <b>Promoters</b> into <b>Passives</b></i>	<b>Frill Me</b> <i>Program elements you do more effectively than parents care ...and therefore are <b>not helping</b> you</i>		
	Students feel accepted by their peers (465, 0.57) Use of technology in instruction (397, 0.65)	Discipline enforced consistently (382, 0.86) Significant financial aid is available (257, 0.66)	Teachers work well with parents (668, 0.45) Traditional values taught (571, 0.28) Staff is customer service oriented (463, 0.37) Challenging educational curriculum (407, 0.47) Communication with constituents (389, 0.31)	Board of Education oversight (364, 0.21) Student admission standards (295, 0.29) Parent involvement with school (241, 0.17) Results of standardized tests (150, 0.02)

**Not Important to Parents**

Done Well (Effectively)

## Close Correlates

New in PSRS 3.0 is standard close correlate analysis. This recognizes the reality that parents often “lump” program effectiveness ratings in constellations. The final report includes the top 10 items that are highly correlated (based on Pearson correlation, .60 or above), and the Excel final report includes a tab with ALL close correlates (.60 or above).

Using the example above, here are the problem effectiveness ratings most related to the program element of “Engaging Teaching” in the minds of parents:

### Engaging teaching

Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.75
Academically competent teachers	0.71
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.71
Qualifications of teachers	0.70
Educational objectives are clear	0.69
Educational vision for the school	0.67
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	0.67
Curriculum up-to-date	0.67
Students are well-prepared for the next educational lev	0.67
Individual attention provided for students	0.66

Note that GraceWorks’ Differential Diagnostic report includes full factor and regression analysis – while the PSRS 3.0 does not. Typically, we when go to the trouble to impute data, and then factor and regression analyze it, our surveys determine over 60% of satisfaction and willingness to refer for any given school – if response rate is adequate. From a “pure statistics” point of view, GraceWorks’ leverage score is similar to regression, and close-correlates gets at the problem of collinearity, that is, variables that mean about the same thing to parents and other evaluators.

## Understanding PSRS 3.0: Qualitative Data

The qualitative section of the report is the longest. Because comments are reported by all the various subgroups.

Comments are reported back school as a whole, and for all demographics

Satisfaction and Willingness to Refer scores given for each respondent

Answers are color coded (Green for Promoters, Yellow for Passives, Red for Detractors)

Suggestions for Improvement for all respondents in blue

Respondents who wish to remain anonymous are marked CONFID

Category/ID	Refer./Satis.	Coached?	Reason for Promoter Passive Detractor	Suggestions For Improvement
<b>School as a whole</b>				
Gwinnette Christian Academy 1271401202	Passive - 8 Apathetic - 7	No	More diversity in staff	To make sound decisions not solely based on parental complaints, but on what is best for the students and school as a whole.
Gwinnette Christian Academy CONFID	Passive - 8 Apathetic - 7	No		
Gwinnette Christian Academy CONFID	Passive - 7 Advocate - 8	No	Before, I would, but latley I've noticed GCA doesn't have good communication skills.	
Gwinnette Christian Academy CONFID	Passive - 7 Advocate - 8	No	More teachers- to many teachers are teaching their own kids. They always make A's More choices with extra classes like spanish and computer classes that taught real skills.	Substitute teachers that can teach when a teacher is absent for several days. Now the kids have a sub and don't get any school work done.
Gwinnette Christian Academy CONFID	Passive - 7 Apathetic - 7	No	A more open perception of young people's capabilities and the readiness to change thinking and practices in light of these perceptions.	
Gwinnette Christian Academy 1167601202	Passive - 7 Apathetic - 7	No	Improvements and higher academic standards for the upper school.	Higher academic standards for the upper school. (Math is OK) The Upper School students should have more writing assignments with critical feedback which would allow them to improve their writing skills.
Gwinnette Christian Academy CONFID	Detractor - 6 Apathetic - 6	No	Better classroom management for the upper grade. There did not appear to be an avenue for complaint/concerns without fear of recrimination.	See previous note.
Gwinnette Christian Academy	Detractor - 5 Apathetic - 7	No	increased teacher/student/parent communication & get accredited	



## Excel-Based Final Report

The companion Excel report contains ten categories like this of volunteers who are willing to help with various marketing tasks. GraceWorks provides you a list of all Promoter tokens by the various categories, which takes about 1 minute to match with a special macro. Detractors and passives, completed and uncompleted, and volunteers are all matched with your names in this simple process.

(Note that the school itself assigns tokens to names, generally one token per person, not family.)

### Layout brochures / promotional material

Token Number	Last Name	First Name
1100201202		
1101401202		
1130001202		
1152501202		
1185701202		
1208601202		
1245501202		
1417201202		
1721501202		

(Note, the token number is the mechanical “key” to the survey. Respondents go to [www.gwmin.com/psrs](http://www.gwmin.com/psrs) and use the token number to take the survey. The survey itself takes about 20 minutes to complete. While your survey is active, GraceWorks sends you a weekly Excel progress report in the same format, so that you can determine who has and has not taken the survey. Even the progress report includes volunteers up to that time.)

## Survey Complete

Token	Last	First
1100201202		
1101401202		
1130001202		
1138001202		

Here are all the categories of marketing volunteers we request on the survey:

- Distribute brochures to local churches / organizations
- Help with marketing events
- Help with public relations – suggest or write stories / press releases
- Layout brochures / promotional materials
- Organize marketing events (e.g. open houses)
- Represent the school at my church
- Serve as a speaker about the school to community / church groups
- Serve on a short-term marketing taskforce
- Make good news phone calls
- Work on the website
- Write copy / promotional material

(We add an additional question like this for our fund development clients, recruiting volunteers for the annual fund.)

Principals are typically surprised by the number of volunteers which come from this question. Our conclusion is that part of the 80/20 problem is that the active 20 do not always know equally qualified volunteers in the 80 – who are not actively volunteering. Identifying these hidden volunteer gems is a subtle, yet powerful benefit of the PSRS.

### Understanding PSRS 3.0: Not Enrolling

If a parent is not planning to re-enroll, PSRS 3.0 asks why, and this is reported back in the Excel spreadsheet report (and is part of the Progress Report as well).

If all eligible children are not enrolled in the school, PSRS asks where they are enrolled, and how that school compares to your school. All this data is matched automatically against your name / token list.

### Children Enrolled in Other Schools

Token	Last	First	Grade / School / Comment
1152501202			1st- Centerville Elementary School
1154601202			2nd- Centerville Elementary. Behavior of children at GCA much better but academics are not as comparable.
1537001202			K- Transferring - Compares Poorly - Annistown Elem.
1537001202			5th- Transferring - Compares Poorly - Annistown Elem.
	Confid		7th-

If a parent is not re-enrolling, we ask the reasons why:

### Not Re-Enrolling Child

Token	Last	First	Reason:
1295201202			The English and science teachers and curriculum. I was skeptical last year and a little disappointed this year. I don't believe that the English teacher actually actively engages with the children's learning experience. In particular, grammar and literature
	Confid		
	Confid		It seem the staff interest is not there for the students.

This too, is matchable – except of course if the parent wished to remain anonymous.

As a matter of mechanics, note that questions asked will vary based on the relationship of the respondent to the school. These questions would only be asked of parents.

### Understanding the PSRS: Generating Leads

Only Promoters are asked: Who else do you know who would be blessed attending our school.

These are reported to you by the person making the referral: name / address / phone number. That way, you can go back to the Promoter, ask them to contact the referral they made, to see if your secretary could call to make an appointment.

This feature alone, which is also included in the weekly progress report, will typically pay for the cost of the survey.

(To preserve confidentiality, an actual sample is not shown here.)

## Understanding PSRS 3.0: Testimonials

Typically lacking in most Christian School websites and literature is testimonials. We ask Promoters: Why did you rate us so highly?

Many of their responses can be transformed into a nice testimonial. Of course, you need to check with the respondent, but in general, using the PSRS, you will never lack for a testimonial again.

These, too, are part of the weekly progress report, as well as the final Excel companion report, all immediately matchable.

### Testimonial Material

Token	Last	First	Here is possible testimonial material ...
1100201202			I think the school does a great job
1101401202			God's hand on GCA is clearly evident.
1104501202			small classroom size, family atmosphere, high academic standards
			The small classes, overall the students are really good kids and the different ages interact & get along well, I like the teachers and my kids, unlike myself at their ages, really enjoy school.
1130001202			Staff, academics, small classes, environment
1138001202			Godly teachers, good environment, Biblical integration, many extras are offered (sports, specials etc) and my kids are happy here.
			Example Christian School seems to be a well rounded environment with a Christian setting. The class sizes are smaller which allows the students to get the extra attention he/she needs. That's what I was looking for in a school. The teachers are loving an
1417201202			Godly staff, excellent curriculum, nice extracurricular activities, good motivators for students (such as SOM)
1478301202			Awesome Staff, excellent academics, and the school is grounded in Christ.
1480301202			

(A note about confidentiality: Token numbers of individuals who wish to remain confidential are not reported on the PSRS, with the common sense exceptions of anyone who volunteers. However, these are only reported on those specific tabs, NOT all tabs. The PDF report likewise has removed all token numbers of respondents who wish to remain anonymous.)

## Understanding PSRS 3.0: Detractor Problems

Detractors are asked: What problems do you, or did you have with our school, and how can it (they) be fixed?

If they are not confidential – a significant number will not be – these comments are reported back to you as part of the final Excel report, and the progress report.

These individuals are literally inviting you to call and talk with them about their problem – and you should. (How many positive comments does it take to overcome one negative word of mouth comment?)

### Detractors with Problem

Token	Last	First	My significant problem with your school is ...
1295201202			My child has had a lovely experience at GCA and I have been very pleased for what it has done for her spiritually. She has blossomed into a wonderful young lady. The teachers have been kind and wonderful. The previous years proved to be much more rewarding
1897101202			increased teacher/student/parent communication & get accredited

## Final Thoughts on PSRS 3.0.

The Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey, version 3.0 does give you all your data in the final Excel Report, except for the token numbers of individuals who wished to remain anonymous.

In addition, a special subgroup report (not pictured here) compares the satisfaction levels of groups within a demographic, such as Boomers vs. Busters.

Except for assessing teachers, the PSRS is designed to be the one quality survey you need annually. Best of all, because questions are asked (or not) in context, you can use the PSRS with all school constituencies, including:

- Donors
- Board Members
- Teachers
- Past Parents
- Alumni
- Grandparents
- Volunteers

In fact, we strongly recommend that you do, in fact, survey all these groups, because Promoters and Volunteers are to found among all of them. Plus, GraceWorks has comparison data for all these groups.

The President of GraceWorks Ministries, Dan Krause, personally reviews the PSRS with your school. Many of these are done on speaker phones, with boards or key executive staff, a one hour review.

The PSRS is the foundational piece GraceWorks uses with all clients. You will be satisfied – or your money back.



## Cross Tab Reports

Besides providing the response totals and percents for practically all closed-ended questions, the Crosstab report provides the satisfaction and willingness to refer scores for these same answers, testing for statistical significance for each group against the entire group.

## Understanding Your Cross-Tab Report

*"I like pigs. Dogs look up to us. Cats look down on us. Pigs treat us as equals."* Winston Churchill

The heart of the Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey (PSRS) is two questions. The first is the so-called "ultimate question" of Harvard loyalty expert Fred Reichheld. His 2006 book, The Ultimate Question, is presently a Wall Street Journal Business best seller. Here's the ultimate question:

*On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely are you to refer \_\_\_\_\_ to a friend, or a colleague?*

Based on 30 years of extensive research in corporate America, Reichheld concluded that about 90% percent of word of mouth referral for an organization will come from people who answer this question with a 9 or 10. Reichheld has labeled these "Promoters."

For decades, Reichheld's chief competitor, J.D. Power and Associates has been using an equally powerful question, which assesses satisfaction:

*On a scale of 0 to 10, overall, how satisfied are you with \_\_\_\_\_?*

Neither question is copyrighted, but we do ask the question exactly as they ask it, and we score it the same way as well.

Note that Reichheld's scoring is stricter -- and we think more accurate -- than Power's.

<u>Reichheld</u> Promoter 9,10	<u>Power</u> Advocate 8,9,10
Passive 7,8	Apathetic 5,6,7
Detractor 0-6, No answer	Assassin 0-4, No answer

Reichheld developed the Net Promoter Score, which is the percent of Promoters less the percent of Detractors. We use his methodology but use the registered term Net Referral Score. To our knowledge, Power does not have an equivalent concept for satisfaction, so we adopted Reichheld's methodology with satisfaction scores: Net Satisfaction Score = % of Advocates less % of Detractors.

That means that both the Net Referral Score and Net Satisfaction Score can range from +100 (where every respondent is a Promoter or Advocate) to -100 (where every respondent is a Detractor or Assassin).

At this writing, the highest score of any Christian school is +90, and the lowest is -44. There is a significant amount of anecdotal evidence that Net Referral Scores correlate highly to enrollment success or failure. We will eventually quantify this

statistically as more schools use the PSRS. Of the two measures, we think the Net Referral Score is most predictive of future enrollment success.

The Net Referral and Net Satisfaction questions are required questions on the Parent Satisfaction Score, which means that every respondent can be categorized as a Promoter, Passive, or Detractor, as well as an Advocate, Apathetic, or Assassin.

By categorizing every respondent, we can calculate Net Referral and Net Satisfaction Scores for subgroups in your school, such as baby boomers, 3rd graders, teachers, or people who make more than \$200,000 a year. Note that respondents were not required to respond to these demographic questions, so the total respondents will not add up to the grand total of respondents.

In addition, the relationship question, while required, is non-exclusive. A current parent might be part of the board, or a teacher -- and are scored in both categories.

The survey itself has a number of conditions. For example, we don't ask past parents what grade their child is in. Nor do we ask students what their annual household income is (should we?) And so on.

The purposes of the PSRS are intricately tied to questions of statistic significance and adequate response rates. The PSRS has three basic purposes:

(1) To understand the overall and specific satisfaction and willingness to refer of current parents and students. Recent past parents or alum could optionally be added to this list.

(2) To identify Promoters throughout your school's constituents, regardless of how they relate to your school.

(3) To understand your parent's concerns -- what these issues are, and how they think about them. This knowledge is invaluable in developing a detailed yearly parent quality survey -- arguably better than focus groups. This is different than the usual approach, which is to write Parent Quality Surveys based on administration / teacher views of concerns, and how they think about them.

Within this framework, acceptable response rates vary by constituency. For example, it would be nice to know your overall donor satisfaction with your school, but they are already telling you by their giving. The main reason for donors to take the PSRS is to identify Promoters -- so that we can proactively work with them to increase their referral effectiveness.

On the other hand, acceptable response rate for current parents is crucial -- 40%+ is the minimum response rate, and we prefer over 60%. We do need to know, reliably, what the overall satisfaction levels are. So, you need to push to encourage your current parents to respond. If the response of this report is not adequate, let's leave it open and re-run this report after you have further promoted the survey. Response



rate for teachers and board likewise should be 90%+ -- there's really no reason for less. The adequacy of your response rates will be reviewed as part of the consultation for this report.

### **How to Read the Cross-Tab Report**

Once you understand what's behind the PSRS, reading the Cross-Tab Report should be fairly straight-forward.

Your overall Net Referral Score and Net Satisfaction Scores are at the very top of the report in bold letters. These will be the same numbers as found in the "School as a Whole" score, typically at the top of your report.

Important: If the Net Referral Scores for your Current Parents are significantly difference, you should use these instead of the "School as a Whole" number. We have seen significant disconnects between various constituencies for different schools ... and these disconnects do matter. However, all things considered, what your current parents think matters the most.

Reading from the left, the first two bolded columns are Net Referral and Net Satisfaction Scores respectively. This provides the Net Satisfaction and Referral Scores for the various subgroups in your school. About 90% of the time, we can see a problem in a given grade based on a significantly lower Net Referral Score ... it's uncanny.

You can see the various satisfaction scores for different categories of constituents who relate to the school. How well are you doing with Generation X, or long-time constituents, or the board?

Are small differences between categories significant? Use the effect size scores to determine that. Whether positive or negative, the way to judge an effect score is:

- .20 - .39 – small effect size
- .40 - .59 – moderate effect size
- .60+ -- large effect size

Therefore, pay attention to items with effect sizes greater than .40, or less than -.40.

The columns to the immediate right of the Net Referral and Net Satisfaction Scores report the results of the F-test. "Yes" indicates that the differences in that category are statistically significant level ( $<.05$ ), which means this result could have only happened by chance less than 5% of the time -- a stringent test. "No" means this difference could have happened by chance more than 5% of the time, and we tell you that percent (as a decimal). So a "No -- .39" means that there is a 39% percent chance that this differing result happened by chance. (At least according to the gods of statistics, who do in fact live in an alternate universe.) Another way to say that is there is a 61% chance that this result did not happen by chance. If the difference was negative, this would

certainly not be enough certainty to fire a teacher over -- but it indicates the need to investigate.

The rest of the report is straight forward. Total responses give you the total respondents by category. The actual numbers of each type of Promoter, Advocate, etc. comprise the remaining columns.

**Two concluding thoughts on the Cross-Tab Report.**

First, the Promoters column represents real people who are willing to promote your school. That's an amazing marketing force for you. Second, you should not assume that non-respondents will have an equal proportion of Promoters or Advocates. A far safer assumption is that at best non-responders are Passives or worse. All of which speaks to need to maximize Promoter response in every possible way.

**A Final Statistical Note.** In all cases -- F-test, Spearman Rho, or Percentiles -- if the number is 9 or less, we do not test. These are either left blank, or labeled with an "N/A".

**Table I**  
**Understanding the Cross Tab Report (PSRS 3.0)**

Col #	Label	Explanation	Lowest Possible Score	High Possible Score	Col #	Label	Explanation	Lowest Possible Score	High Possible Score
1	Question	Short version of the question	N/A	N/A	11	Effect Size	Effect size on willingness to refer, being part of this subgroup (or answering the question this way).	(-4.00)	(+4.00)
2	IMP EFF DIFF LEV	Importance, Effectiveness, Difference, Leverage Scores ( <i>Program Elements only</i> )	IMP, EFF, LEV = 0, DIFF = (-5)	IMP / EFF / DIFF = 5, LEV = 1000	12	Responses	Total number of people responding to this category	0	Total number of respondents
3	Answer	Answer to the question	N/A	N/A	13	% of respondents	Percent of respondents to the whole, or for the total number of respondents to that question	0%	100%
4	Referral	Net Referral score for this group	-100	+100	14	Promoters	Persons answering the referral question with a 9 or 10	0	Total number of respondents
5	Anova	Indicates statistical significance with p score (<.05 is significant)	.000	0.99	15	Passives	Persons answering the referral question with a 7 or 8	0	Total number of respondents
6	Percentile	Percentile rank of willingness to refer for this particular subgroup	0	99	16	Detractors	Persons answering the referral question with 0 to 6	0	Total number of respondents
7	Effect Size	Effect size on willingness to refer, being part of this subgroup (or answering the question this way).	(-4.00)	(+4.00)	17	Advocates	Persons answering the satisfaction question with an 8, 9, or 10	0	Total number of respondents
8	Satisfaction	Net Satisfaction Score for this category	(-100)	+100	18	Apathetics	Persons answering the satisfaction question with an 5, 6, or 7	0	Total number of respondents

9	Anova	Indicates statistical significance with p score (<.05 is significant)	.000	0.99	19	Assassins	Persons answering the satisfaction question with a 0 to 4	0	Total number of respondents
10	Percentile	Percentile rank of satisfaction for this particular subgroup	0	99					

# Cross Tab

Martin Luther High School		Net Referral Score	55		Net Satisfaction Score	74						Net Referral Score			Net Satisfaction Score		
		Closing Date:	6/15/2012		Total Responses	173						Promoters	Passives	Detractors	Advocates	Apathetics	Assassins
Question	Answer	Referral	ANOVA	Percentile	Effect	Satisfaction	ANOVA	Percentile	Effect	Responses	% Resp	Promoters	Passives	Detractors	Advocates	Apathetics	Assassins
School as a whole	Martin Luther High School	55		53%		74		53%		173	100%	113	42	18	137	27	9
Gender	Female	59	N (.848)	57%	0.01	71	N (.861)	39%	0.01	116	67%	79	26	11	88	22	6
Gender	Male	48	N (.895)	45%	-0.01	80	N (.846)	68%	-0.01	56	32%	34	15	7	48	5	3
Relationship to School	Current Parent or Guardian	46	Y (.041)	24%	-0.25	59	Y (.021)	13%	-0.34	37	21%	23	8	6	27	5	5
Relationship to School	Past Parent	71	N (.086)	82%	0.20	83	N (.229)	74%	0.14	52	30%	39	11	2	44	7	1
Relationship to School	School Board Member	83	N/A	N/A	0.15	83	N/A	N/A	0.12	6	3%	5	1	0	5	1	0
Relationship to School	Member of Sponsoring Church	62	N (.288)	47%	0.10	70	N (.752)	37%	-0.03	66	38%	47	13	6	49	14	3
Relationship to School	Teacher or Other Staff	100	N/A	N/A	0.42	100	N/A	N/A	0.30	6	3%	6	0	0	6	0	0
Relationship to School	Alumnus	54	N (.551)	N/A	0.07	76	N (.254)	N/A	0.17	37	21%	25	7	5	29	7	1
Relationship to School	Current Student		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Volunteer - Leader (besides School Board)	75	N/A	N/A	0.12	75	N/A	N/A	0.04	4	2%	3	1	0	3	1	0
Relationship to School	Volunteer - Other	69	N (.258)	61%	0.17	72	N (.669)	38%	-0.06	36	21%	29	3	4	29	4	3
Relationship to School	Grandparent	90	N (.076)	76%	0.55	90	N (.192)	51%	0.40	10	6%	9	1	0	9	1	0
Relationship to School	Donor	70	Y (.047)	53%	0.22	86	Y (.028)	74%	0.24	57	33%	43	11	3	50	6	1
Relationship to School	Community Business	43	N/A	N/A	-0.26	71	N/A	N/A	-0.22	7	4%	4	2	1	6	0	1
Drive Time to School	0 - 5 minutes	44	N (.118)	22%	-0.30	50	N (.281)	12%	-0.26	16	9%	10	3	3	11	2	3
Drive Time to School	6 - 10 minutes	59	N (.901)	47%	0.02	72	N (.780)	39%	-0.05	29	17%	20	6	3	23	4	2
Drive Time to School	11 - 15 minutes	49	N (.645)	36%	-0.06	69	N (.530)	36%	-0.08	45	26%	28	11	6	34	8	3
Drive Time to School	16 - 20 minutes	65	N (.752)	62%	0.07	82	N (.269)	59%	0.26	17	10%	12	4	1	14	3	0
Drive Time to School	21 - 25 minutes	38	N (.421)	18%	-0.17	71	N (.527)	38%	-0.13	21	12%	12	5	4	15	6	0
Drive Time to School	26 - 30 minutes	60	N (.758)	59%	0.06	90	N (.583)	80%	0.15	10	6%	7	2	1	9	1	0
Drive Time to School	31 - 45 minutes	43	N/A	N/A	-0.04	86	N/A	N/A	0.03	7	4%	3	4	0	6	1	0
Drive Time to School	More than 45 minutes	64	N (.517)	N/A	0.17	73	N (.123)	N/A	-0.16	11	6%	7	4	0	9	1	1
Drive Time to School	Out of the area of the school	82	N (.067)	90%	0.42	94	N (.057)	80%	0.44	17	10%	14	3	0	16	1	0
Which grades	Preschool	0	N/A	N/A	-0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	1%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which grades	Kindergarten		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Which grades	1st		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Which grades	2nd	0	N/A	N/A	-0.13	0	N/A	N/A	-0.23	2	1%	1	0	1	1	0	1
Which grades	3rd		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Which grades	4th	33	N/A	N/A	-0.11	0	N/A	N/A	-0.38	3	2%	2	0	1	1	1	1
Which grades	5th	100	N/A	N/A	0.07	100	N/A	N/A	0.10	1	1%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which grades	6th	100	N/A	N/A	0.16	67	N/A	N/A	-0.07	3	2%	3	0	0	2	1	0
Which grades	7th	33	N/A	N/A	-0.11	67	N/A	N/A	-0.07	3	2%	1	2	0	2	1	0
Which grades	8th		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Which grades	9th	58	N (.708)	N/A	-0.06	50	N (.127)	N/A	-0.43	12	7%	9	1	2	8	2	2
Which grades	10th	13	N/A	N/A	-0.67	25	N/A	N/A	-0.79	8	5%	4	1	3	5	0	3
Which grades	11th	44	N (.558)	N/A	-0.13	72	N (.607)	N/A	-0.12	18	10%	10	6	2	14	3	1
Which grades	12th	63	N/A	N/A	-0.13	63	N/A	N/A	-0.36	8	5%	6	1	1	6	1	1
Which grades	No children in grades preschool - 12th		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Child attends	St. Paul - Fairmont	100	N/A	N/A	0.09	50	N/A	N/A	-0.04	2	1%	2	0	0	1	1	0
Child attends	St. James - Northrop	17	N/A	N/A	-0.28	50	N/A	N/A	-0.26	6	3%	2	3	1	4	1	1
Child attends	St. Paul's - Truman	100	N/A	N/A	0.07	100	N/A	N/A	-0.02	1	1%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Child attends	Other Christian school		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Generational Cohort	1946 - 1961	71	N (.160)	78%	0.36	100	N (.164)	95%	0.36	14	8%	10	4	0	14	0	0
Generational Cohort	1962 - 1981	30	Y (.000)	9%	-0.63	35	Y (.000)	4%	-0.76	23	13%	13	4	6	13	5	5
Race	Caucasian	44	Y (.029)	23%	-0.28	58	Y (.022)	14%	-0.34	36	21%	22	8	6	26	5	5

Race	Other	100	N/A	N/A	0.07	100	N/A	N/A	-0.02	1	1%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Average Grades	Mostly A's	44	N (.273)	13%	-0.22	61	N (.198)	7%	-0.29	18	10%	11	4	3	13	3	2
Average Grades	Mostly B's	56	N (.596)	48%	-0.07	69	N (.555)	24%	-0.14	16	9%	11	3	2	13	1	2
Average Grades	Mostly C's	50	N/A	N/A	-0.07	50	N/A	N/A	-0.17	2	1%	1	1	0	1	1	0
Average Grades	D's or less	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.36	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.33	1	1%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Length of Relationship	1 - 2 years	43	N/A	N/A	-0.10	57	N/A	N/A	-0.15	7	4%	5	0	2	5	1	1
Length of Relationship	3 - 5 years	37	Y (.006)	19%	-0.43	52	Y (.005)	14%	-0.49	27	16%	14	9	4	18	5	4
Length of Relationship	6 - 10 years	74	N (.332)	82%	0.20	84	N (.344)	77%	0.21	19	11%	15	3	1	16	3	0
Length of Relationship	11 - 15 years	42	N (.321)	33%	-0.16	81	N (.395)	61%	0.12	31	18%	17	10	4	25	6	0
Length of Relationship	16 - 20 years	78	N (.232)	84%	0.26	94	N (.239)	91%	0.26	18	10%	14	4	0	17	1	0
Length of Relationship	21 - 25 years	77	N (.145)	83%	0.29	77	N (.517)	48%	0.12	22	13%	19	1	2	17	5	0
Length of Relationship	Less than a year	67	N/A	N/A	0.10	100	N/A	N/A	0.24	3	2%	2	1	0	3	0	0
Length of Relationship	More than 25 years	61	N (.166)	44%	0.22	79	N (.173)	57%	0.21	33	19%	24	5	4	28	3	2
Length of Relationship	No relationship with school at present	18	N (.151)	N/A	-0.42	36	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.84	11	6%	3	7	1	6	3	2
Level of Education	High School Graduate	20	N/A	N/A	-0.51	0	N/A	N/A	-0.48	5	3%	3	0	2	2	1	2
Level of Education	Some College	25	N/A	N/A	-0.51	50	N/A	N/A	-0.67	8	5%	4	2	2	6	0	2
Level of Education	Associate's Degree	83	N/A	N/A	0.21	83	N/A	N/A	0.12	6	3%	5	1	0	5	1	0
Level of Education	Bachelor's Degree	58	N (.734)	N/A	0.08	75	N (.820)	N/A	-0.06	12	7%	8	3	1	9	3	0
Level of Education	Masters Degree	40	N/A	N/A	-0.19	60	N/A	N/A	-0.11	5	3%	3	1	1	4	0	1
Level of Education	Doctorate	0	N/A	N/A	-0.04	100	N/A	N/A	-0.02	1	1%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Household Income	\$25,000 to \$34,999	50	N/A	N/A	0.03	100	N/A	N/A	-0.04	2	1%	1	1	0	2	0	0
Household Income	\$35,000 to \$49,999	67	N/A	N/A	0.05	100	N/A	N/A	0.12	3	2%	2	1	0	3	0	0
Household Income	\$50,000 to \$74,999	75	N/A	N/A	0.03	75	N/A	N/A	-0.11	8	5%	7	0	1	7	0	1
Household Income	\$75,000 to \$99,999	20	N/A	N/A	-0.62	0	N/A	N/A	-0.48	5	3%	3	0	2	2	1	2
Household Income	\$100,000 to \$149,999	33	N/A	N/A	-0.33	67	N/A	N/A	-0.32	9	5%	4	4	1	7	1	1
Household Income	\$150,000 to \$199,999	67	N/A	N/A	0.05	67	N/A	N/A	-0.19	3	2%	2	1	0	2	1	0
Household Income	\$200,000+	100	N/A	N/A	0.14	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	2	1%	2	0	0	2	0	0
All children enrolled	No children of school age	59	N (.187)	N/A	0.07	76	N (.105)	N/A	0.08	111	64%	76	25	10	87	21	3
All children enrolled	No	33	N (.173)	41%	-0.23	73	N (.489)	51%	-0.12	30	17%	14	12	4	25	2	3
All children enrolled	Yes	56	N (.604)	27%	-0.07	60	N (.148)	5%	-0.27	25	14%	18	3	4	18	4	3
Reenrolling	N/A	59	Y (.011)	81%	0.08	79	Y (.006)	80%	0.10	140	81%	94	34	12	114	22	4
Reenrolling	No	-33	N/A	N/A	-0.70	-33	N/A	N/A	-0.50	3	2%	1	0	2	1	0	2
Reenrolling	Yes	47	N (.352)	11%	-0.16	63	N (.069)	5%	-0.30	30	17%	18	8	4	22	5	3
Knew about MLHS	Do not have to be Lutheran to attend	58	N (.328)	N/A	0.06	81	Y (.022)	N/A	0.16	93	54%	62	23	8	76	16	1
Knew about MLHS	Student / teacher ratio of 9 to 1	55	N (.667)	N/A	0.02	78	N (.093)	N/A	0.19	55	32%	36	13	6	44	10	1
Knew about MLHS	Fully accredited	54	N (.496)	N/A	0.03	79	N (.139)	N/A	0.10	87	50%	55	24	8	70	16	1
Knew about MLHS	College preparatory curriculum	58	N (.174)	N/A	0.09	82	Y (.015)	N/A	0.19	83	48%	57	17	9	69	13	1
Knew about MLHS	Student small group Bible Studies for students	49	N (.846)	N/A	-0.01	78	N (.337)	N/A	0.09	59	34%	38	12	9	47	11	1
Knew about MLHS	"College in the classroom" program for college credit	55	N (.835)	N/A	0.00	77	N (.258)	N/A	0.12	56	32%	39	9	8	44	11	1
Knew about MLHS	TV Media courses offered	68	N (.178)	N/A	0.17	85	Y (.030)	N/A	0.27	47	27%	37	5	5	41	5	1
Knew about MLHS	Has a strong fine arts program, particularly music	61	N (.188)	N/A	0.10	85	Y (.004)	N/A	0.24	79	46%	55	17	7	67	12	0
Knew about MLHS	Strong Christian character development	57	N (.115)	N/A	0.09	82	Y (.007)	N/A	0.19	95	55%	63	23	9	79	15	1
Knew about MLHS	Graduates consistently score 3 to 5 points higher on the ACT over state averages	64	N (.100)	N/A	0.16	89	Y (.002)	N/A	0.31	61	35%	43	14	4	54	7	0

Knew about MLHS	About a third of our students receive financial aid	51	N (.882)	N/A	-0.02	79	N (.391)	N/A	0.11	43	25%	27	11	5	35	7	1
Quality institution	N/A	57	N (.548)	N/A	-0.03	68	N (.123)	N/A	-0.15	68	39%	47	13	8	53	8	7
Quality institution	No	-50	N/A	N/A	-0.34	0	N/A	N/A	-0.29	2	1%	0	1	1	1	0	1
Quality institution	Yes	55	N (.259)	N/A	0.05	80	Y (.047)	N/A	0.12	103	60%	66	28	9	83	19	1
Christian character vs public	Somewhat worse	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.72	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.54	2	1%	0	0	2	0	0	2
Christian character vs public	About the same	-27	Y (.002)	N/A	-0.91	18	Y (.004)	N/A	-0.84	11	6%	1	6	4	3	7	1
Christian character vs public	Somewhat better	45	N (.114)	N/A	-0.16	72	N (.147)	N/A	-0.14	65	38%	35	24	6	49	14	2
Christian character vs public	Much better	80	Y (.000)	N/A	0.35	89	Y (.000)	N/A	0.32	87	50%	74	9	4	80	4	3
Academically competent teachers	N/A	53	N (.750)	N/A	0.00	75	N (.480)	N/A	0.04	113	65%	71	31	11	88	22	3
Academically competent teachers	1 to 3	0	N/A	N/A	-1.10	13	N/A	N/A	-0.73	8	5%	3	2	3	4	1	3
Academically competent teachers	4 to 5	67	N (.058)	N/A	0.22	81	N (.586)	N/A	0.06	52	30%	39	9	4	45	4	3
Bible / Religion curriculum	N/A	51	N (.815)	N/A	-0.01	75	N (.544)	N/A	0.03	113	65%	69	33	11	88	22	3
Bible / Religion curriculum	1 to 3	50	N/A	N/A	-0.15	50	N/A	N/A	-0.03	4	2%	3	0	1	3	0	1
Bible / Religion curriculum	4 to 5	63	N (.633)	N/A	0.05	73	N (.564)	N/A	-0.06	56	32%	41	9	6	46	5	5
Challenging educational curriculum	N/A	53	N (.724)	N/A	0.00	75	N (.403)	N/A	0.05	112	65%	70	31	11	87	22	3
Challenging educational curriculum	1 to 3	0	N/A	N/A	-0.63	0	N/A	N/A	-0.52	4	2%	2	0	2	2	0	2
Challenging educational curriculum	4 to 5	63	N (.306)	N/A	0.11	77	N (.865)	N/A	0.00	57	33%	41	11	5	48	5	4
Christian character development	N/A	51	N (.809)	N/A	-0.01	75	N (.544)	N/A	0.03	113	65%	69	33	11	88	22	3
Christian character development	1 to 3	21	Y (.010)	N/A	-0.60	36	Y (.009)	N/A	-0.66	14	8%	7	3	4	9	1	4
Christian character development	4 to 5	74	N (.108)	N/A	0.20	83	N (.350)	N/A	0.12	46	27%	37	6	3	40	4	2
Christian environment	N/A	51	N (.841)	N/A	-0.01	75	N (.502)	N/A	0.04	111	64%	68	32	11	86	22	3
Christian environment	1 to 3	20	Y (.010)	N/A	-0.69	40	Y (.033)	N/A	-0.65	10	6%	5	2	3	7	0	3
Christian environment	4 to 5	69	N (.175)	N/A	0.16	79	N (.700)	N/A	0.04	52	30%	40	8	4	44	5	3
Communication with constituents	N/A	53	N (.531)	N/A	0.01	76	N (.226)	N/A	0.06	116	67%	73	32	11	91	22	3
Communication with constituents	1 to 3	16	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.85	26	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.94	19	11%	9	4	6	11	2	6
Communication with constituents	4 to 5	79	Y (.008)	N/A	0.38	92	N (.059)	N/A	0.27	38	22%	31	6	1	35	3	0
Curriculum up-to-date	N/A	54	N (.506)	N/A	0.02	76	N (.298)	N/A	0.06	115	66%	73	31	11	90	22	3
Curriculum up-to-date	1 to 3	36	N (.151)	N/A	-0.42	55	N (.185)	N/A	-0.39	11	6%	7	1	3	8	1	2
Curriculum up-to-date	4 to 5	62	N (.669)	N/A	0.05	74	N (.706)	N/A	-0.05	47	27%	33	10	4	39	4	4
Discipline enforced consistently	N/A	54	N (.464)	N/A	0.02	76	N (.200)	N/A	0.07	117	68%	74	32	11	92	22	3
Discipline enforced consistently	1 to 3	22	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.79	33	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.87	18	10%	10	2	6	12	0	6
Discipline enforced consistently	4 to 5	74	Y (.030)	N/A	0.31	87	N (.149)	N/A	0.21	38	22%	29	8	1	33	5	0
Educational objectives are clear	N/A	54	N (.506)	N/A	0.02	76	N (.298)	N/A	0.06	115	66%	73	31	11	90	22	3
Educational objectives are clear	1 to 3	18	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.91	27	Y (.004)	N/A	-0.84	11	6%	6	1	4	7	0	4

Educational objectives are clear	4 to 5	66	N (.178)	N/A	0.17	81	N (.594)	N/A	0.06	47	27%	34	10	3	40	5	2
Educational vision for the school	N/A	53	N (.599)	N/A	0.01	75	N (.366)	N/A	0.05	113	65%	71	31	11	88	22	3
Educational vision for the school	1 to 3	8	Y (.000)	N/A	-1.18	17	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.99	12	7%	6	1	5	7	0	5
Educational vision for the school	4 to 5	71	Y (.028)	N/A	0.27	85	N (.237)	N/A	0.13	48	28%	36	10	2	42	5	1
Engaging teaching	N/A	54	N (.506)	N/A	0.02	76	N (.298)	N/A	0.06	115	66%	73	31	11	90	22	3
Engaging teaching	1 to 3	24	Y (.001)	N/A	-0.72	41	Y (.002)	N/A	-0.69	17	10%	9	3	5	11	2	4
Engaging teaching	4 to 5	71	N (.070)	N/A	0.25	83	N (.345)	N/A	0.13	41	24%	31	8	2	36	3	2
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	N/A	54	N (.624)	N/A	0.01	75	N (.331)	N/A	0.05	114	66%	72	31	11	89	22	3
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	1 to 3	0	Y (.000)	N/A	-1.07	20	Y (.011)	N/A	-0.78	10	6%	4	2	4	5	2	3
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	4 to 5	69	N (.097)	N/A	0.20	82	N (.766)	N/A	0.03	49	28%	37	9	3	43	3	3
Financial stability of school	N/A	53	N (.776)	N/A	-0.01	75	N (.522)	N/A	0.04	112	65%	70	31	11	87	22	3
Financial stability of school	1 to 3	56	N (.307)	N/A	-0.10	62	N (.124)	N/A	-0.24	34	20%	25	3	6	26	3	5
Financial stability of school	4 to 5	63	N (.404)	N/A	0.15	85	N (.402)	N/A	0.15	27	16%	18	8	1	24	2	1
High academic standards for students	N/A	52	N (.801)	N/A	-0.01	75	N (.502)	N/A	0.04	111	64%	69	31	11	86	22	3
High academic standards for students	1 to 3	-17	N/A	N/A	-0.92	0	N/A	N/A	-0.81	6	3%	2	1	3	3	0	3
High academic standards for students	4 to 5	68	N (.106)	N/A	0.18	80	N (.492)	N/A	0.07	56	32%	42	10	4	48	5	3
High behavioral standards for students	N/A	53	N (.648)	N/A	0.01	75	N (.366)	N/A	0.05	113	65%	71	31	11	88	22	3
High behavioral standards for students	1 to 3	0	Y (.000)	N/A	-1.10	14	Y (.000)	N/A	-1.19	14	8%	6	2	6	8	0	6
High behavioral standards for students	4 to 5	76	Y (.011)	N/A	0.32	89	N (.058)	N/A	0.24	46	27%	36	9	1	41	5	0
Individual attention provided for students	N/A	54	N (.576)	N/A	0.01	75	N (.383)	N/A	0.05	114	66%	72	31	11	89	22	3
Individual attention provided for students	1 to 3	0	Y (.000)	N/A	-1.22	17	Y (.000)	N/A	-1.10	12	7%	5	2	5	7	0	5
Individual attention provided for students	4 to 5	72	Y (.023)	N/A	0.28	85	N (.170)	N/A	0.16	47	27%	36	9	2	41	5	1
Individual student differences are accommodated	N/A	54	N (.506)	N/A	0.02	76	N (.347)	N/A	0.05	115	66%	73	31	11	90	22	3
Individual student differences are accommodated	1 to 3	25	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.69	35	Y (.001)	N/A	-0.68	20	12%	10	5	5	12	3	5
Individual student differences are accommodated	4 to 5	74	Y (.030)	N/A	0.31	89	N (.152)	N/A	0.21	38	22%	30	6	2	35	2	1
Key life skills are taught	N/A	54	N (.484)	N/A	0.02	76	N (.313)	N/A	0.05	116	67%	74	31	11	91	22	3
Key life skills are taught	1 to 3	27	Y (.003)	N/A	-0.54	41	Y (.005)	N/A	-0.56	22	13%	12	4	6	14	3	5
Key life skills are taught	4 to 5	74	N (.068)	N/A	0.28	89	N (.258)	N/A	0.17	35	20%	27	7	1	32	2	1
Parent / teacher communication	N/A	52	N (.789)	N/A	-0.01	74	N (.521)	N/A	0.03	115	66%	72	31	12	89	22	4
Parent / teacher communication	1 to 3	11	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.88	28	Y (.000)	N/A	-0.84	18	10%	8	4	6	10	3	5



Parent / teacher communication	4 to 5	<b>83</b>	Y (.003)	N/A	<b>0.41</b>	<b>95</b>	Y (.045)	N/A	<b>0.28</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>23%</b>	33	7	0	38	2	0
Parent involvement with school	N/A	<b>52</b>	N (.749)	N/A	<b>0.00</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.502)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>64%</b>	69	31	11	86	22	3
Parent involvement with school	1 to 3	<b>44</b>	Y (.033)	N/A	<b>-0.44</b>	<b>44</b>	Y (.011)	N/A	<b>-0.61</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9%</b>	10	3	3	10	3	3
Parent involvement with school	4 to 5	<b>65</b>	N (.217)	N/A	<b>0.16</b>	<b>83</b>	N (.350)	N/A	<b>0.12</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27%</b>	34	8	4	41	2	3
Principal addresses parent concerns	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.609)	N/A	<b>0.01</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.587)	N/A	<b>0.03</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>68%</b>	75	31	12	92	22	4
Principal addresses parent concerns	1 to 3	<b>0</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.10</b>	<b>18</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.06</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10%</b>	6	5	6	8	4	5
Principal addresses parent concerns	4 to 5	<b>84</b>	Y (.001)	N/A	<b>0.47</b>	<b>97</b>	Y (.007)	N/A	<b>0.39</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>22%</b>	32	6	0	37	1	0
Principal leadership	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.648)	N/A	<b>0.01</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.480)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>65%</b>	71	31	11	88	22	3
Principal leadership	1 to 3	<b>-7</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.22</b>	<b>21</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	5	3	6	8	1	5
Principal leadership	4 to 5	<b>78</b>	Y (.005)	N/A	<b>0.36</b>	<b>87</b>	N (.058)	N/A	<b>0.24</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27%</b>	37	8	1	41	4	1
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.560)	N/A	<b>0.01</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.587)	N/A	<b>0.03</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>68%</b>	75	31	12	92	22	4
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	1 to 3	<b>-7</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.29</b>	<b>14</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	5	3	6	7	2	5
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	4 to 5	<b>80</b>	Y (.003)	N/A	<b>0.40</b>	<b>93</b>	Y (.030)	N/A	<b>0.30</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>24%</b>	33	8	0	38	3	0
Qualifications of teachers	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.699)	N/A	<b>0.00</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.480)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>65%</b>	71	31	11	88	22	3
Qualifications of teachers	1 to 3	<b>0</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.20</b>	<b>15</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	5	3	5	7	1	5
Qualifications of teachers	4 to 5	<b>74</b>	Y (.008)	N/A	<b>0.33</b>	<b>87</b>	N (.082)	N/A	<b>0.22</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>27%</b>	37	8	2	42	4	1
Reasonable tuition	N/A	<b>52</b>	N (.789)	N/A	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>74</b>	N (.588)	N/A	<b>0.03</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>66%</b>	72	31	12	89	22	4
Reasonable tuition	1 to 3	<b>43</b>	Y (.003)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.50</b>	<b>43</b>	Y (.002)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.63</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12%</b>	14	2	5	14	2	5
Reasonable tuition	4 to 5	<b>70</b>	Y (.040)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>92</b>	N (.067)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.27</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21%</b>	27	9	1	34	3	0
Results of standardized tests	N/A	<b>55</b>	N (.325)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>76</b>	N (.211)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>68%</b>	76	31	11	93	22	3
Results of standardized tests	1 to 3	<b>18</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.01</b>	<b>18</b>	Y (.004)	N/A	<b>-0.84</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6%</b>	6	1	4	6	1	4
Results of standardized tests	4 to 5	<b>64</b>	N (.232)	N/A	<b>0.16</b>	<b>82</b>	N (.718)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>25%</b>	31	10	3	38	4	2
Safe learning environment	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.648)	N/A	<b>0.01</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.544)	N/A	<b>0.03</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>65%</b>	71	31	11	88	22	3
Safe learning environment	1 to 3	<b>0</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>-0.87</b>	<b>0</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>-0.63</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	3	0	3	3	0	3
Safe learning environment	4 to 5	<b>65</b>	N (.190)	N/A	<b>0.15</b>	<b>80</b>	N (.619)	N/A	<b>0.05</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>31%</b>	39	11	4	46	5	3
School Board oversight	N/A	<b>56</b>	N (.213)	N/A	<b>0.05</b>	<b>76</b>	N (.245)	N/A	<b>0.06</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>70%</b>	79	31	11	95	23	3
School Board oversight	1 to 3	<b>6</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-0.97</b>	<b>35</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-0.80</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>10%</b>	7	4	6	11	1	5
School Board oversight	4 to 5	<b>74</b>	Y (.042)	N/A	<b>0.31</b>	<b>86</b>	N (.212)	N/A	<b>0.19</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20%</b>	27	7	1	31	3	1
School's use of resources	N/A	<b>54</b>	N (.441)	N/A	<b>0.02</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.478)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>67%</b>	74	31	11	90	23	3
School's use of resources	1 to 3	<b>17</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-0.91</b>	<b>25</b>	Y (.004)	N/A	<b>-0.79</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	6	2	4	7	1	4
School's use of resources	4 to 5	<b>67</b>	N (.161)	N/A	<b>0.18</b>	<b>84</b>	N (.384)	N/A	<b>0.11</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>26%</b>	33	9	3	40	3	2
Significant financial aid is available	N/A	<b>54</b>	N (.312)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>76</b>	N (.251)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>72%</b>	79	35	11	98	24	3
Significant financial aid is available	1 to 3	<b>23</b>	Y (.000)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.91</b>	<b>38</b>	Y (.015)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.65</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	7	2	4	9	0	4
Significant financial aid is available	4 to 5	<b>69</b>	N (.129)	N/A	<b>0.23</b>	<b>80</b>	N (.623)	N/A	<b>0.05</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20%</b>	27	5	3	30	3	2
Staff is customer service oriented	N/A	<b>52</b>	N (.707)	N/A	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>73</b>	N (.891)	N/A	<b>0.01</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>70%</b>	76	32	13	93	23	5

Staff is customer service oriented	1 to 3	<b>40</b>	Y (.026)	N/A	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>55</b>	N (.076)	N/A	<b>-0.37</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12%</b>	12	4	4	15	1	4
Staff is customer service oriented	4 to 5	<b>75</b>	Y (.045)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>91</b>	N (.189)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18%</b>	25	6	1	29	3	0
Student admission standards	N/A	<b>55</b>	N (.290)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>76</b>	N (.157)	N/A	<b>0.07</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>71%</b>	80	31	12	96	24	3
Student admission standards	1 to 3	<b>47</b>	N (.127)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>53</b>	N (.223)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.30</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9%</b>	10	2	3	11	1	3
Student admission standards	4 to 5	<b>57</b>	N (.898)	N/A	<b>0.00</b>	<b>77</b>	N (.458)	N/A	<b>-0.11</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>20%</b>	23	9	3	30	2	3
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	N/A	<b>52</b>	N (.651)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>72</b>	N (.721)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>68%</b>	74	31	13	90	23	5
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	1 to 3	<b>-20</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>-0.99</b>	<b>-20</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>-0.79</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	2	0	3	2	0	3
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	4 to 5	<b>70</b>	Y (.033)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>88</b>	N (.125)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>29%</b>	37	11	2	45	4	1
Students feel accepted by their peers	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.688)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>73</b>	N (.707)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>69%</b>	76	31	13	92	23	5
Students feel accepted by their peers	1 to 3	<b>25</b>	Y (.038)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.55</b>	<b>42</b>	Y (.037)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.58</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	6	3	3	8	1	3
Students feel accepted by their peers	4 to 5	<b>71</b>	N (.106)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>88</b>	N (.405)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>24%</b>	31	8	2	37	3	1
Teachers are Christian role models	N/A	<b>54</b>	N (.576)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.439)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>66%</b>	72	31	11	88	23	3
Teachers are Christian role models	1 to 3	<b>8</b>	Y (.000)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.99</b>	<b>31</b>	Y (.001)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.84</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	6	2	5	8	1	4
Teachers are Christian role models	4 to 5	<b>72</b>	Y (.047)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>85</b>	N (.296)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27%</b>	35	9	2	41	3	2
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	N/A	<b>54</b>	N (.491)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>74</b>	N (.475)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>69%</b>	76	31	12	92	23	4
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	1 to 3	<b>8</b>	Y (.000)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-1.04</b>	<b>25</b>	Y (.023)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.63</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	5	3	4	7	1	4
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	4 to 5	<b>71</b>	N (.068)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>88</b>	N (.535)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.08</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>24%</b>	32	8	2	38	3	1
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	N/A	<b>53</b>	N (.634)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>74</b>	N (.564)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>68%</b>	74	31	12	90	23	4
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	1 to 3	<b>0</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.09</b>	<b>25</b>	Y (.002)	N/A	<b>-0.84</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	4	4	4	7	1	4
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	4 to 5	<b>75</b>	Y (.032)	N/A	<b>0.28</b>	<b>89</b>	N (.258)	N/A	<b>0.15</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>25%</b>	35	7	2	40	3	1
Teachers work well with parents	N/A	<b>55</b>	N (.445)	N/A	<b>0.02</b>	<b>74</b>	N (.339)	N/A	<b>0.05</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>70%</b>	78	31	12	94	23	4
Teachers work well with parents	1 to 3	<b>-8</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.24</b>	<b>15</b>	Y (.000)	N/A	<b>-1.22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	4	4	5	7	1	5
Teachers work well with parents	4 to 5	<b>77</b>	Y (.013)	N/A	<b>0.35</b>	<b>92</b>	N (.067)	N/A	<b>0.26</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>23%</b>	31	7	1	36	3	0
Traditional values taught	N/A	<b>54</b>	N (.401)	N/A	<b>0.03</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.343)	N/A	<b>0.05</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>68%</b>	75	32	11	92	23	3
Traditional values taught	1 to 3	<b>-14</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>-1.17</b>	<b>-14</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>-0.96</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4%</b>	3	0	4	3	0	4
Traditional values taught	4 to 5	<b>67</b>	N (.144)	N/A	<b>0.18</b>	<b>83</b>	N (.500)	N/A	<b>0.08</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>28%</b>	35	10	3	42	4	2
Use of technology in instruction	N/A	<b>55</b>	N (.325)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>75</b>	N (.294)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>68%</b>	76	31	11	92	23	3
Use of technology in instruction	1 to 3	<b>21</b>	Y (.001)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.79</b>	<b>36</b>	Y (.025)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>-0.57</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	7	3	4	9	1	4
Use of technology in instruction	4 to 5	<b>66</b>	N (.219)	N/A	<b>0.17</b>	<b>83</b>	N (.726)	N/A	<b>0.04</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>24%</b>	30	8	3	36	3	2

Low student / teacher ratio	N/A	54	N (.441)	N/A	0.02	75	N (.418)	N/A	0.04	116	67%	74	31	11	90	23	3
Low student / teacher ratio	1 to 3	0	N/A	N/A	-0.67	20	N/A	N/A	-0.54	5	3%	2	1	2	3	0	2
Low student / teacher ratio	4 to 5	62	N (.520)	N/A	0.07	77	N (.848)	N/A	0.01	52	30%	37	10	5	44	4	4
Accreditation	N/A	52	N (.706)	N/A	0.00	73	N (.682)	N/A	0.02	122	71%	77	32	13	93	25	4
Accreditation	1 to 3	20	N/A	N/A	-0.56	20	N/A	N/A	-0.42	5	3%	3	0	2	3	0	2
Accreditation	4 to 5	65	N (.339)	N/A	0.12	83	N (.712)	N/A	0.04	46	27%	33	10	3	41	2	3
College prep curriculum	N/A	53	N (.634)	N/A	0.01	74	N (.564)	N/A	0.03	117	68%	74	31	12	90	23	4
College prep curriculum	1 to 3	14	N/A	N/A	-0.69	43	N/A	N/A	-0.53	7	4%	3	2	2	5	0	2
College prep curriculum	4 to 5	65	N (.306)	N/A	0.12	80	N (.710)	N/A	0.03	49	28%	36	9	4	42	4	3
Small group Bible studies for students	N/A	55	N (.257)	N/A	0.04	76	N (.303)	N/A	0.05	122	71%	78	33	11	96	23	3
Small group Bible studies for students	1 to 3	47	N (.101)	N/A	-0.33	53	N (.377)	N/A	-0.22	15	9%	10	2	3	11	1	3
Small group Bible studies for students	4 to 5	58	N (.891)	N/A	0.00	75	N (.587)	N/A	-0.08	36	21%	25	7	4	30	3	3
College in the Classroom program for college credit	N/A	52	N (.655)	N/A	0.00	73	N (.812)	N/A	0.01	124	72%	78	33	13	96	23	5
College in the Classroom program for college credit	1 to 3	25	N/A	N/A	-0.62	50	N/A	N/A	-0.55	8	5%	4	2	2	6	0	2
College in the Classroom program for college credit	4 to 5	68	N (.300)	N/A	0.14	80	N (.470)	N/A	0.10	41	24%	31	7	3	35	4	2
TV media course	N/A	55	N (.217)	N/A	0.03	75	N (.249)	N/A	0.05	136	79%	88	35	13	106	26	4
TV media course	1 to 3	-13	N/A	N/A	-1.10	25	N/A	N/A	-0.67	8	5%	2	3	3	5	0	3
TV media course	4 to 5	72	N (.187)	N/A	0.22	83	N (.911)	N/A	0.02	29	17%	23	4	2	26	1	2
Fine arts program	N/A	54	N (.406)	N/A	0.03	75	N (.250)	N/A	0.06	118	68%	75	32	11	92	23	3
Fine arts program	1 to 3	25	N/A	N/A	-0.78	38	N/A	N/A	-0.48	8	5%	4	2	2	5	1	2
Fine arts program	4 to 5	62	N (.426)	N/A	0.10	77	N (.706)	N/A	-0.05	47	27%	34	8	5	40	3	4
Athletics Program	N/A	54	N (.529)	N/A	0.02	75	N (.439)	N/A	0.04	114	66%	72	31	11	88	23	3
Athletics Program	1 to 3	53	Y (.032)	N/A	-0.40	53	N (.206)	N/A	-0.29	17	10%	12	2	3	12	2	3
Athletics Program	4 to 5	60	N (.386)	N/A	0.12	81	N (.837)	N/A	0.00	42	24%	29	9	4	37	2	3
Match Token	No	38	Y (.007)	59%	-0.29	63	Y (.028)	57%	-0.24	56	32%	30	17	9	38	15	3
Match Token	Yes	63	Y (.007)	48%	0.14	79	Y (.028)	43%	0.12	117	68%	83	25	9	99	12	6
Coached	No	55	N (1.000)	51%	0.00	74	N (1.000)	50%	0.00	173	100%	113	42	18	137	27	9

**Student Cross Tab**

		Net Referral Score <b>2</b>			Net Satisfaction Score <b>41</b>							Net Referral Score			Net Satisfaction Score		
<b>Martin Luther High School</b>		Closing Date: 6/15/2012			Total Responses 59												
Question	Answer	Referral	ANOVA	%	Effect	Satisfaction	ANOVA	%	Effect	Responses	% Resp	Promoters	Passives	Detractors	Advocates	Apathetics	Assassins
School as a whole	Martin Luther High School	2		4%		41		7%		59	100%	18	24	17	36	11	12
Gender	Female	9	N (.130)	4%	0.15	48	N (.605)	12%	0.06	33	56%	12	12	9	22	5	6
Gender	Male	-8	N (.130)	2%	-0.19	31	N (.605)	5%	-0.08	26	44%	6	12	8	14	6	6
Relationship to School	Current Parent or Guardian		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Past Parent		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	School Board Member		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Member of Sponsoring Church	33	N/A	N/A	0.04	33	N/A	N/A	0.07	3	5%	2	0	1	2	0	1
Relationship to School	Teacher or Other Staff		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Alumnus	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.15	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.14	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Relationship to School	Current Student	2	N (1.000)	26%	0.00	41	N (1.000)	24%	0.00	59	100%	18	24	17	36	11	12
Relationship to School	Volunteer - Leader (besides School Board)		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Volunteer - Other	100	N/A	N/A	0.11	100	N/A	N/A	0.13	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Relationship to School	Grandparent		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Donor		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Community Business		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Relationship to School	Other		N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0%						
Which church	Antrim, Truman	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.08	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.10	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	bethel church fairmont mn	100	N/A	N/A	0.11	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.10	1	2%	1	0	0	0	0	1
Which church	Bethel Evangelical Free Church, Fairmont	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.01	1	2%	0	0	1	0	1	0
Which church	Bethel Evangelical Free Church, Fairmont MN	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.26	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	0	1	1	0	0
Which church	Bethle Evangelicle Free, Farmont MN	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	Community Covenant Church, Huntley	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	0	1	1	0	0
Which church	Fairmont baptist church, Fairmont, MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Gace Lutheran Church Fairmont Minnesota	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	Grace United Medithoidst verson center MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Immanuel Lutheran Church LCMS, Estherville, Iowa	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Immanuel Lutheran Church, Fairmont, MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Immanuel Lutheran Estherville Iowa	100	N/A	N/A	0.11	100	N/A	N/A	0.13	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	Immanuel Lutheran Fairmont	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	saint pauls luthran truman mn	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.01	1	2%	0	1	0	0	1	0
Which church	Salem, Madelia	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	south branch	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.23	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.28	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	St Pauls Lutheran Truman	0	N/A	N/A	0.08	0	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	1	0	0	1	0
Which church	st pauls lutheran truman mn	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	st pauls luthern church truman mn	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.05	1	2%	0	1	0	0	1	0
Which church	St. James Lutheran Church Northrop	100	N/A	N/A	0.11	100	N/A	N/A	0.13	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. James Lutheran Church, Northrop	50	N/A	N/A	0.15	100	N/A	N/A	0.17	2	3%	1	1	0	2	0	0

Which church	St. James Lutheran Northrop, Minnesota	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. James Lutheran, Northrop	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. James Lutheran, Northrop, MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.12	2	3%	0	2	0	2	0	0
Which church	St. James Luthern Church Northrop	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.05	1	2%	0	1	0	0	1	0
Which church	St. Johns Lutheran, Sherburn, MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. John's Lutheran, South Branch, MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. John's Willow Creek	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. Johns, South Branch	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. Paul Lutheran Church, Fairmont	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. Paul Lutheran Fairmont Minnesota	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	0	N/A	N/A	-0.01	1	2%	1	0	0	0	1	0
Which church	St. Paul's Lutheran Church Fairmont	100	N/A	N/A	0.11	100	N/A	N/A	0.13	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. Paul's Lutheran Church Truman	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	0	N/A	N/A	-0.02	2	3%	1	0	1	1	0	1
Which church	St. Pauls Lutheran Church Truman, MN	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.15	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.14	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	St. Paul's Lutheran Church, Truman	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	St. Pauls Lutheran Fairmont	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.08	0	N/A	N/A	-0.05	1	2%	0	0	1	0	1	0
Which church	St. Pauls Lutheran, Truman, MN	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.04	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.10	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	St. Paul's Luthern Truman	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.05	1	2%	0	1	0	0	1	0
Which church	St. Paul's Truman MN	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.08	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.19	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	St. Pauls, Fairmont	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	St.James Lutheran Church	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	St.James Lutheran Northrop	-100	N/A	N/A	0.08	-100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	St.James Lutheran Northrop	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	Staint James Lutheran Church, Northrop MN	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.05	1	2%	0	0	1	0	1	0
Which church	Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church, Trimont	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Trinity Lutheran Church, Trimont	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.19	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.19	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	Trinity-Fieldon, Lewisville MN	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.01	1	2%	0	1	0	0	1	0
Which church	Waverly Lutheran Church Trimont	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.04	0	N/A	N/A	-0.05	1	2%	0	0	1	0	1	0
Which church	Waverly Lutheran Church-Trimont MN	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	Waverly Lutheran, truman	0	N/A	N/A	0.04	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Yes, in Ceylon, Minnesota	100	N/A	N/A	0.11	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Which church	zion	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.26	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.14	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	Zion Lutheran Church, Fairmont	0	N/A	N/A	0.00	100	N/A	N/A	0.04	1	2%	0	1	0	1	0	0
Which church	Zion Luthern Church in Northrop	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.15	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.23	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Which church	Zion Luthern, Northrop, MN	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.23	-100	N/A	N/A	-0.19	1	2%	0	0	1	0	0	1
Length of Relationship	Less than a year	0	N/A	N/A	-0.19	22	N/A	N/A	-0.16	9	15%	3	3	3	5	1	3
Length of Relationship	1 - 2 years	0	N (.311)	2%	-0.19	33	N (.756)	3%	-0.08	12	20%	3	6	3	7	2	3
Length of Relationship	3 - 5 years	0	N (.339)	4%	0.07	45	N (.575)	7%	0.06	33	56%	10	13	10	20	8	5
Length of Relationship	6 - 10 years	33	N/A	N/A	0.19	100	N/A	N/A	0.16	3	5%	1	2	0	3	0	0

Length of Relationship	11 - 15 years	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Student Grade	9th Grade	-29	Y (.003)	10%	-0.62	7	N (.136)	15%	-0.34	14	24%	3	4	7	6	3	5
Student Grade	10th Grade	13	N (.262)	71%	0.25	47	N (.845)	40%	0.04	15	25%	5	7	3	10	2	3
Student Grade	11th Grade	0	N (.339)	49%	0.14	50	N (.384)	49%	0.18	16	27%	5	6	5	10	4	2
Student Grade	12th Grade	21	N (.423)	78%	0.19	57	N (.646)	50%	0.09	14	24%	5	7	2	10	2	2
Years Attended	1 year	-43	N/A	N/A	-0.64	-29	N/A	N/A	-0.51	7	12%	1	2	4	2	1	4
Years Attended	2 years	25	N/A	N/A	0.19	25	N/A	N/A	-0.11	8	14%	4	2	2	5	0	3
Years Attended	3 years	17	N/A	N/A	0.15	83	N/A	N/A	0.18	6	10%	2	3	1	5	1	0
Years Attended	4 years	-17	N/A	N/A	-0.23	33	N/A	N/A	-0.18	6	10%	1	3	2	4	0	2
Years Attended	10 years	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	100	N/A	N/A	0.08	1	2%	1	0	0	1	0	0
Years Attended	11 years	-22	N/A	N/A	-0.15	56	N/A	N/A	0.34	9	15%	2	3	4	5	4	0
Years Attended	12 years	17	N (.301)	69%	0.25	33	N (.887)	38%	0.04	12	20%	5	4	3	6	4	2
Years Attended	More than 12 years	13	N/A	N/A	0.30	88	N/A	N/A	0.26	8	14%	1	7	0	7	1	0
Match Token	No	-7	N (.492)	9%	-0.16	14	N (.311)	8%	-0.24	14	24%	5	3	6	7	2	5
Match Token	Yes	4	N (.492)	2%	0.05	49	N (.311)	3%	0.07	45	76%	13	21	11	29	9	7
Coached	No	2	N (1.000)	3%	0.00	41	N (1.000)	6%	0.00	59	100%	18	24	17	36	11	12



## Subgroups Report

The Subgroups report looks at the relative satisfaction and willingness to refer of subgroups within a dimension, such as Generation X parents compared to Baby Boomer parents. Only statistically significant results are reported.

## Understanding the Subgroups Report

On the main Cross-Tabs Report, we used F-tests to compare the satisfaction and referral scores of subcategories to the whole, such as “Are Baby Boomers significantly more satisfied with our school than all our survey respondents.”

A second way to ask the question is: “Are Baby Boomers significantly more (or less) satisfied than Generation X’ers?” That’s exactly what the “Comparison between Subgroups” Report does. It looks at all the relationships within a category (question), and creates a line only if either referral or satisfaction are significant. To be more user friendly, if the relationship is not significant ( $p < .05$ ) the correlation is not reported.

(Like the earlier “group to the whole comparison,” the “subcategory to subcategory” F-tests use transformed raw test scores -- square root method. The decimal reported is a two-tail Pearson ( $p$ ) score. A “.000” indicates a  $p$  score of less than .001, which is highly significant.)

The Subgroups Report is a very powerful way to answer questions like: Are higher income parents more satisfied than lower income parents? Or are more educated parents more satisfied than less educated parents? Where differences are significant, the subcategories answers to these questions become very important -- helping you understand “the why of it.”

Note that on the Subgroup report, only statistically significant results are reported – the F-test must pass on either the satisfaction or willingness to refer results.



**Table I  
Understanding the Subgroups Tab Report**

<b>Col #</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Lowest Possible Score</b>	<b>High Possible Score</b>	<b>Col #</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Lowest Possible Score</b>	<b>High Possible Score</b>
1	Referral	Net referral score of the group with the higher net referral score	(-100)	100	6	Satisfaction	Net Satisfaction Score	(-100)	100
2	Group	Subgroup with the higher referral score within the dimension	N/A	N/A	7	Group	Subgroup with the higher satisfaction score within the dimension	N/A	N/A
3	ANOVA	Result of the F-test comparison between the two groups	.000	0.99	8	ANOVA	Result of F-test comparison between the two groups	.000	0.99
4	Referral	Net referral score of the group with the lower net referral score	(-100)	100	9	Satisfaction	Net satisfaction score of the group with the lower net satisfaction score	(-100)	100
5	Group	Subgroup with the lower net referral score within the dimension	N/A	N/A	10	Group	Subgroup with the lower satisfaction score within the dimension	N/A	N/A

## Comparisons between Subgroups

Referral	Group	ANOVA	Referral	Group	Satisfaction	Group	ANOVA	Satisfaction	Group
<i>Relationship to School</i>									
71	Past Parent	Y (.044)	46	Current Parent or Guardian	83	Past Parent	Y (.027)	59	Current Parent or Guardian
54	Alumnus	N (.163)	46	Current Parent or Guardian	76	Alumnus	Y (.037)	59	Current Parent or Guardian
70	Donor	Y (.040)	46	Current Parent or Guardian	86	Donor	Y (.004)	59	Current Parent or Guardian
<i>Drive Time to School</i>									
82	Out of the area of the school	N (.071)	44	0 - 5 minutes	94	Out of the area of the school	Y (.028)	50	0 - 5 minutes
82	Out of the area of the school	Y (.028)	38	21 - 25 minutes	94	Out of the area of the school	Y (.017)	71	21 - 25 minutes
<i>Generational Cohort</i>									
71	1946 - 1961	Y (.033)	30	1962 - 1981	100	1946 - 1961	Y (.003)	35	1962 - 1981
<i>Length of Relationship</i>									
42	11 - 15 years	N (.339)	37	3 - 5 years	81	11 - 15 years	Y (.017)	52	3 - 5 years
42	11 - 15 years	N (.489)	18	No relationship with school at present	81	11 - 15 years	Y (.018)	36	No relationship with school at present
78	16 - 20 years	N (.065)	37	3 - 5 years	94	16 - 20 years	Y (.015)	52	3 - 5 years
78	16 - 20 years	Y (.027)	18	No relationship with school at present	94	16 - 20 years	Y (.025)	36	No relationship with school at present
77	21 - 25 years	Y (.044)	37	3 - 5 years	77	21 - 25 years	Y (.045)	52	3 - 5 years
77	21 - 25 years	Y (.035)	18	No relationship with school at present	77	21 - 25 years	Y (.047)	36	No relationship with school at present
74	6 - 10 years	N (.083)	37	3 - 5 years	84	6 - 10 years	Y (.028)	52	3 - 5 years
61	More than 25 years	Y (.035)	37	3 - 5 years	79	More than 25 years	Y (.012)	52	3 - 5 years
74	6 - 10 years	N (.052)	18	No relationship with school at present	84	6 - 10 years	Y (.038)	36	No relationship with school at present
61	More than 25 years	N (.051)	18	No relationship with school at present	79	More than 25 years	Y (.017)	36	No relationship with school at present
<i>Reenrolling</i>									
59	N/A	N (.160)	47	Yes	79	N/A	Y (.038)	63	Yes
<i>Christian character vs public</i>									
80	Much better	Y (.000)	-27	About the same	89	Much better	Y (.000)	18	About the same
45	Somewhat better	Y (.019)	-27	About the same	72	Somewhat better	Y (.012)	18	About the same
80	Much better	Y (.000)	45	Somewhat better	89	Much better	Y (.003)	72	Somewhat better
<i>Christian character development</i>									
51	N/A	Y (.015)	21	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.014)	36	x 1 to 3
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.027)	21	x 1 to 3	83	y 4 to 5	Y (.014)	36	x 1 to 3
<i>Christian environment</i>									
51	N/A	Y (.013)	20	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.037)	40	x 1 to 3
69	y 4 to 5	Y (.032)	20	x 1 to 3	79	y 4 to 5	N (.050)	40	x 1 to 3
<i>Communication with constituents</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	16	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.000)	26	x 1 to 3
79	y 4 to 5	Y (.018)	53	N/A	92	y 4 to 5	N (.221)	76	N/A

79	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	16	x 1 to 3	92	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	26	x 1 to 3
<i>Discipline enforced consistently</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.001)	22	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.000)	33	x 1 to 3
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.001)	22	x 1 to 3	87	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	33	x 1 to 3
<i>Educational objectives are clear</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.001)	18	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.006)	27	x 1 to 3
66	y 4 to 5	Y (.004)	18	x 1 to 3	81	y 4 to 5	Y (.009)	27	x 1 to 3
<i>Educational vision for the school</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	8	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.001)	17	x 1 to 3
71	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	8	x 1 to 3	85	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	17	x 1 to 3
<i>Engaging teaching</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.002)	24	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.004)	41	x 1 to 3
71	y 4 to 5	Y (.005)	24	x 1 to 3	83	y 4 to 5	Y (.005)	41	x 1 to 3
<i>Facility allows for adequate learning environment</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.011)	20	x 1 to 3
69	y 4 to 5	Y (.002)	0	x 1 to 3	82	y 4 to 5	Y (.024)	20	x 1 to 3
<i>High behavioral standards for students</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.000)	14	x 1 to 3
76	y 4 to 5	Y (.029)	53	N/A	89	y 4 to 5	N (.215)	75	N/A
76	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	89	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	14	x 1 to 3
<i>Individual attention provided for students</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.000)	17	x 1 to 3
72	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	85	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	17	x 1 to 3
<i>Individual student differences are accommodated</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.002)	25	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.004)	35	x 1 to 3
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.002)	25	x 1 to 3	89	y 4 to 5	Y (.002)	35	x 1 to 3
<i>Key life skills are taught</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.008)	27	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.009)	41	x 1 to 3
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.013)	27	x 1 to 3	89	y 4 to 5	Y (.010)	41	x 1 to 3
<i>Parent / teacher communication</i>									
52	N/A	Y (.000)	11	x 1 to 3	74	N/A	Y (.001)	28	x 1 to 3
83	y 4 to 5	Y (.006)	52	N/A	95	y 4 to 5	N (.145)	74	N/A
83	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	11	x 1 to 3	95	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	28	x 1 to 3
<i>Parent involvement with school</i>									
52	N/A	Y (.049)	44	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.019)	44	x 1 to 3
65	y 4 to 5	N (.079)	44	x 1 to 3	83	y 4 to 5	Y (.014)	44	x 1 to 3
<i>Principal addresses parent concerns</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.000)	18	x 1 to 3
84	y 4 to 5	Y (.003)	53	N/A	97	y 4 to 5	Y (.034)	75	N/A
84	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	97	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	18	x 1 to 3

<i>Principal leadership</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	-7	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.000)	21	x 1 to 3
78	y 4 to 5	Y (.015)	53.09735	N/A	87	y 4 to 5	N (.207)	75	N/A
78	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	-7	x 1 to 3	87	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	21	x 1 to 3
<i>Principal provides staff oversight and accountability</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	-7	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.000)	14	x 1 to 3
80	y 4 to 5	Y (.008)	53	N/A	93	y 4 to 5	N (.103)	75	N/A
80	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	-7	x 1 to 3	93	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	14	x 1 to 3
<i>Qualifications of teachers</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.000)	15	x 1 to 3
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.024)	53	N/A	87	y 4 to 5	N (.249)	75	N/A
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	87	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	15	x 1 to 3
<i>Reasonable tuition</i>									
52	N/A	Y (.017)	43	x 1 to 3	74	N/A	Y (.009)	43	x 1 to 3
70	y 4 to 5	Y (.009)	43	x 1 to 3	92	y 4 to 5	Y (.001)	43	x 1 to 3
<i>Results of standardized tests</i>									
55	N/A	Y (.000)	18	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.005)	18	x 1 to 3
64	y 4 to 5	Y (.003)	18	x 1 to 3	82	y 4 to 5	Y (.013)	18	x 1 to 3
<i>School Board oversight</i>									
56	N/A	Y (.000)	6	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.001)	35	x 1 to 3
74	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	6	x 1 to 3	86	y 4 to 5	Y (.001)	35	x 1 to 3
<i>School's use of resources</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.001)	17	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.008)	25	x 1 to 3
67	y 4 to 5	Y (.004)	17	x 1 to 3	84	y 4 to 5	Y (.008)	25	x 1 to 3
<i>Significant financial aid is available</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.000)	23	x 1 to 3	76	N/A	Y (.022)	38	x 1 to 3
69	y 4 to 5	Y (.003)	23	x 1 to 3	80	y 4 to 5	Y (.034)	38	x 1 to 3
<i>Staff is customer service oriented</i>									
75	y 4 to 5	Y (.022)	40	x 1 to 3	91	y 4 to 5	Y (.019)	55	x 1 to 3
<i>Students feel accepted by their peers</i>									
71	y 4 to 5	Y (.030)	25	x 1 to 3	88	y 4 to 5	Y (.035)	42	x 1 to 3
<i>Teachers are Christian role models</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.000)	8	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.004)	31	x 1 to 3
72	y 4 to 5	Y (.001)	8	x 1 to 3	85	y 4 to 5	Y (.002)	31	x 1 to 3
<i>Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.000)	8	x 1 to 3	74	N/A	Y (.034)	25	x 1 to 3
71	y 4 to 5	Y (.001)	8	x 1 to 3	88	y 4 to 5	Y (.036)	25	x 1 to 3
<i>Teachers exhibit care and concern for students</i>									
53	N/A	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	74	N/A	Y (.006)	25	x 1 to 3
75	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	0	x 1 to 3	89	y 4 to 5	Y (.002)	25	x 1 to 3
<i>Teachers work well with parents</i>									

55	N/A	Y (.000)	-8	x 1 to 3	74	N/A	Y (.000)	15	x 1 to 3
77	y 4 to 5	Y (.034)	55	N/A	92	y 4 to 5	N (.207)	74	N/A
77	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	-8	x 1 to 3	92	y 4 to 5	Y (.000)	15	x 1 to 3
<i>Use of technology in instruction</i>									
55	N/A	Y (.001)	21	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	Y (.030)	36	x 1 to 3
66	y 4 to 5	Y (.010)	21	x 1 to 3	83	y 4 to 5	N (.063)	36	x 1 to 3
<i>Athletics Program</i>									
54	N/A	Y (.046)	53	x 1 to 3	75	N/A	N (.217)	53	x 1 to 3
<i>Match Token</i>									
63	Yes	Y (.007)	38	No	79	Yes	Y (.028)	63	No



## Leverage Report

The Leverage Report lists out, in order, program elements that most impact satisfaction and willingness to refer, from most to least impactful. Note that any given program element may reflect a strength or a weakness. (See the Satisfaction Quadrant report to determine that.)

**Average Importance / Leverage** – For program elements only, the top score for each program element is the average importance (1 to 5, 5 being high), for all respondents to that program element. (“How important is ...?”)

The lower number is the leverage score. Leverage is an attempt to reduce the efficacy towards increasing satisfaction by improving that particular program element relative to all the others. In other words, it is an attempt to answer the question, in one scale, to:

#### Leverage Scale

The leverage score attempts to answer the question: What programmatic improvements will most improve overall satisfaction?

(The answer, in your case, is that teachers need to work well with parents.)

The leverage score is based on the following:

- (1) The relative importance of the program item (25%). The higher the average importance, the greater the leverage score.
- (2) The difference in net satisfaction and willingness to refer between individuals who scored this item high (5 or 4) versus low (2 or 1) (25%) The greater this difference, the higher the leverage score.
- (3) The difference in effect sizes (power) for satisfaction and willingness to refer for individuals who scored the item high or low (25%). The higher the effect size between high and low program effectiveness ratings, the higher the leverage score.
- (4) The variability, or “spread,” of people answers to the questions (25%). (In other words, if the far majority of people felt this item was done well, then the leverage decreases.)

- (5) A small adjustment for the variability of answers (Standard Deviation) for respondents within program rating categories (plus or minus 5%). The more consistent the satisfaction / referral levels for programmatic effectiveness ratings, the larger the leverage score.
- (6) An adjustment for non-response. Items with significant non-response will have lower leverage scores. The adjustment is small except when non-response exceeds 20%. (Subtraction of the squared percent of non-responses, typically no more than 25%.)

The scale for leverage is 0 to 1000.

In addition to the leverage scores, the leverage scores in the PSRS version 3.0 include:

- (1) Percentile ranks of effectiveness scores. This compares your effectiveness ratings for each program element with effectiveness ratings of all the other schools in our database. This feature was launched with data from over 60 schools in PSRS 2.0, with another 30 current PSRS clients to be scored by the end of 2011. One of the leverage scores sorts is by percentile rank, highest to lowest. You would expect the highest percentile items (if over the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) to be areas of strength for your school.
- (2) Difference (Quality gap), importance, and effectiveness scores are also included with the PSRS, for the very first time, and the leverage scores are sorted on each. For each sort, the items on the top of the lists are most problematic (difference), most important to your parents (importance),

and most effectively done – relative to the other items – (effectiveness).

- (3) One leverage sort includes the satisfaction quadrant rankings, which are secondarily sorted by difference (quality gap) scores. What you are most concerned about are “Disgust me” items with high difference and high leverage scores. The top ten areas for improvement are highlighted.



## Program Elements by Leverage Score

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
1	Engaging teaching	833	0.88	Disgust	12	4.73	3.86
2	Discipline enforced consistently	793	0.88	Disgust	20	4.57	3.70
3	Key life skills are taught	792	0.75	Disgust	8	4.46	3.70
4	Principal addresses parent concerns	788	0.87	Disgust	10	4.58	3.71
5	Parent / teacher communication	739	0.67	Disgust	17	4.47	3.79
6	Christian character development	728	0.77	Disgust	5	4.75	3.98
7	Individual student differences are accommodated	708	0.54	Annoy	41	4.37	3.82
8	Communication with constituents	704	0.64	Annoy	13	4.38	3.73
9	Qualifications of teachers	692	0.68	Disgust	25	4.75	4.07
10	Principal leadership	686	0.67	Disgust	18	4.63	3.97
11	High behavioral standards for students	678	0.63	Disgust	27	4.62	3.98
12	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	675	0.67	Disgust	22	4.56	3.89
13	Reasonable tuition	671	0.61	Annoy	11	4.28	3.67
14	Teachers are Christian role models	660	0.65	Disgust	4	4.68	4.04
15	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	655	0.65	Disgust	4	4.72	4.07
16	Financial stability of school	648	0.80	Annoy	14	4.14	3.34
17	Staff is customer service oriented	627	0.49		14	4.22	3.73
18	Individual attention provided for students	573	0.49		44	4.58	4.08
19	Curriculum up-to-date	572	0.63	Disgust	29	4.61	3.98
20	Academically competent teachers*	560	0.70	Disgust	42	4.93	4.23
21	Parent involvement with school	554	0.50	Annoy	22	4.34	3.84
22	Teachers work well with parents	550	0.48		13	4.40	3.92
23	Christian environment	544	0.48		16	4.66	4.18
24	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	518	0.46		29	4.46	4.00
25	Students feel accepted by their peers	517	0.45		39	4.43	3.98
26	Educational objectives are clear	499	0.50		35	4.52	4.02
27	Use of technology in instruction	498	0.36		61	4.32	3.96
28	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	488	0.47		32	4.53	4.05
29	High academic standards for students*	462	0.26	Thrill	74	4.69	4.43
30	Challenging educational curriculum*	461	0.33	Thrill	87	4.77	4.44
31	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level*	460	0.34	Thrill	78	4.74	4.40
32	School Board oversight	448	0.18	Frill	22	3.90	3.73
33	Educational vision for the school	436	0.32		41	4.37	4.05
34	Bible / Religion curriculum*	406	0.25	Thrill	42	4.63	4.38
35	Significant financial aid is available	380	0.35		41	4.07	3.72
36	Small group Bible studies for students	379	-0.20	Frill	N/A	3.86	4.06
37	Athletics Program	376	-0.11	Frill	N/A	3.61	3.72
38	School's use of resources	375	0.31		19	4.25	3.95
39	Student admission standards	374	-0.08	Frill	21	3.71	3.80
40	Traditional values taught*	371	0.28	Thrill	12	4.49	4.21
41	Safe learning environment*	370	0.25	Thrill	6	4.52	4.27

42	College prep curriculum*	369	0.15	Thrill	N/A	4.48	4.33
43	Results of standardized tests	269	-0.02	Frill	29	4.09	4.11
44	College in the Classroom program for college credit*	246	-0.04	Frill	N/A	4.20	4.24
45	TV media course*	209	-0.53	Frill	N/A	3.59	4.12
46	Fine arts program*	146	-0.23	Frill	N/A	4.00	4.23
47	Accreditation*	139	-0.20	Frill	N/A	4.14	4.34
48	Low student / teacher ratio*	100	-0.47	Frill	N/A	4.04	4.51
Due to the small response size leverage was calculated using only factors 1 and 3 and the validity of leverage for this report is questionable.							

## Program Elements by Percentile

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
36	Small group Bible studies for students	379	-0.20	Frill	N/A	3.86	4.06
37	Athletics Program	376	-0.11	Frill	N/A	3.61	3.72
42	College prep curriculum*	369	0.15	Thrill	N/A	4.48	4.33
44	College in the Classroom program for college credit*	246	-0.04	Frill	N/A	4.20	4.24
45	TV media course*	209	-0.53	Frill	N/A	3.59	4.12
46	Fine arts program*	146	-0.23	Frill	N/A	4.00	4.23
47	Accreditation*	139	-0.20	Frill	N/A	4.14	4.34
48	Low student / teacher ratio*	100	-0.47	Frill	N/A	4.04	4.51
30	Challenging educational curriculum*	461	0.33	Thrill	87	4.77	4.44
31	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level*	460	0.34	Thrill	78	4.74	4.40
29	High academic standards for students*	462	0.26	Thrill	74	4.69	4.43
27	Use of technology in instruction	498	0.36		61	4.32	3.96
18	Individual attention provided for students	573	0.49		44	4.58	4.08
34	Bible / Religion curriculum*	406	0.25	Thrill	42	4.63	4.38
20	Academically competent teachers*	560	0.70	Disgust	42	4.93	4.23
7	Individual student differences are accommodated	708	0.54	Annoy	41	4.37	3.82
33	Educational vision for the school	436	0.32		41	4.37	4.05
35	Significant financial aid is available	380	0.35		41	4.07	3.72
25	Students feel accepted by their peers	517	0.45		39	4.43	3.98
26	Educational objectives are clear	499	0.50		35	4.52	4.02
28	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	488	0.47		32	4.53	4.05
24	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	518	0.46		29	4.46	4.00
43	Results of standardized tests	269	-0.02	Frill	29	4.09	4.11
19	Curriculum up-to-date	572	0.63	Disgust	29	4.61	3.98
11	High behavioral standards for students	678	0.63	Disgust	27	4.62	3.98
9	Qualifications of teachers	692	0.68	Disgust	25	4.75	4.07
21	Parent involvement with school	554	0.50	Annoy	22	4.34	3.84
32	School Board oversight	448	0.18	Frill	22	3.90	3.73
12	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	675	0.67	Disgust	22	4.56	3.89
39	Student admission standards	374	-0.08	Frill	21	3.71	3.80
2	Discipline enforced consistently	793	0.88	Disgust	20	4.57	3.70
38	School's use of resources	375	0.31		19	4.25	3.95
10	Principal leadership	686	0.67	Disgust	18	4.63	3.97
5	Parent / teacher communication	739	0.67	Disgust	17	4.47	3.79
23	Christian environment	544	0.48		16	4.66	4.18
17	Staff is customer service oriented	627	0.49		14	4.22	3.73
16	Financial stability of school	648	0.80	Annoy	14	4.14	3.34
8	Communication with constituents	704	0.64	Annoy	13	4.38	3.73
22	Teachers work well with parents	550	0.48		13	4.40	3.92
1	Engaging teaching	833	0.88	Disgust	12	4.73	3.86
40	Traditional values taught*	371	0.28	Thrill	12	4.49	4.21

13	Reasonable tuition	671	0.61	Annoy	11	4.28	3.67
4	Principal addresses parent concerns	788	0.87	Disgust	10	4.58	3.71
3	Key life skills are taught	792	0.75	Disgust	8	4.46	3.70
41	Safe learning environment*	370	0.25	Thrill	6	4.52	4.27
6	Christian character development	728	0.77	Disgust	5	4.75	3.98
14	Teachers are Christian role models	660	0.65	Disgust	4	4.68	4.04
15	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	655	0.65	Disgust	4	4.72	4.07
Due to the small response size leverage was calculated using only factors 1 and 3 and the validity of leverage for this report is questionable.							

## Program Elements by Importance

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
20	Academically competent teachers*	560	0.70	Disgust	42	4.93	4.23
30	Challenging educational curriculum*	461	0.33	Thrill	87	4.77	4.44
6	Christian character development	728	0.77	Disgust	5	4.75	3.98
9	Qualifications of teachers	692	0.68	Disgust	25	4.75	4.07
31	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level*	460	0.34	Thrill	78	4.74	4.40
1	Engaging teaching	833	0.88	Disgust	12	4.73	3.86
15	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	655	0.65	Disgust	4	4.72	4.07
29	High academic standards for students*	462	0.26	Thrill	74	4.69	4.43
14	Teachers are Christian role models	660	0.65	Disgust	4	4.68	4.04
23	Christian environment	544	0.48		16	4.66	4.18
10	Principal leadership	686	0.67	Disgust	18	4.63	3.97
34	Bible / Religion curriculum*	406	0.25	Thrill	42	4.63	4.38
11	High behavioral standards for students	678	0.63	Disgust	27	4.62	3.98
19	Curriculum up-to-date	572	0.63	Disgust	29	4.61	3.98
4	Principal addresses parent concerns	788	0.87	Disgust	10	4.58	3.71
18	Individual attention provided for students	573	0.49		44	4.58	4.08
2	Discipline enforced consistently	793	0.88	Disgust	20	4.57	3.70
12	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	675	0.67	Disgust	22	4.56	3.89
28	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	488	0.47		32	4.53	4.05
26	Educational objectives are clear	499	0.50		35	4.52	4.02
41	Safe learning environment*	370	0.25	Thrill	6	4.52	4.27
40	Traditional values taught*	371	0.28	Thrill	12	4.49	4.21
42	College prep curriculum*	369	0.15	Thrill	N/A	4.48	4.33
5	Parent / teacher communication	739	0.67	Disgust	17	4.47	3.79
24	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	518	0.46		29	4.46	4.00
3	Key life skills are taught	792	0.75	Disgust	8	4.46	3.70
25	Students feel accepted by their peers	517	0.45		39	4.43	3.98
22	Teachers work well with parents	550	0.48		13	4.40	3.92
8	Communication with constituents	704	0.64	Annoy	13	4.38	3.73
33	Educational vision for the school	436	0.32		41	4.37	4.05
7	Individual student differences are accommodated	708	0.54	Annoy	41	4.37	3.82
21	Parent involvement with school	554	0.50	Annoy	22	4.34	3.84
27	Use of technology in instruction	498	0.36		61	4.32	3.96
13	Reasonable tuition	671	0.61	Annoy	11	4.28	3.67
38	School's use of resources	375	0.31		19	4.25	3.95
17	Staff is customer service oriented	627	0.49		14	4.22	3.73
44	College in the Classroom program for college credit*	246	-0.04	Frill	N/A	4.20	4.24
47	Accreditation*	139	-0.20	Frill	N/A	4.14	4.34
16	Financial stability of school	648	0.80	Annoy	14	4.14	3.34
43	Results of standardized tests	269	-0.02	Frill	29	4.09	4.11
35	Significant financial aid is available	380	0.35		41	4.07	3.72

48	Low student / teacher ratio*	100	-0.47	Frill	N/A	4.04	4.51
46	Fine arts program*	146	-0.23	Frill	N/A	4.00	4.23
32	School Board oversight	448	0.18	Frill	22	3.90	3.73
36	Small group Bible studies for students	379	-0.20	Frill	N/A	3.86	4.06
39	Student admission standards	374	-0.08	Frill	21	3.71	3.80
37	Athletics Program	376	-0.11	Frill	N/A	3.61	3.72
45	TV media course*	209	-0.53	Frill	N/A	3.59	4.12
Due to the small response size leverage was calculated using only factors 1 and 3 and the validity of leverage for this report is questionable.							

## Program Elements by Effectiveness

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
48	Low student / teacher ratio*	100	-0.47	Frill	N/A	4.04	4.51
30	Challenging educational curriculum*	461	0.33	Thrill	87	4.77	4.44
29	High academic standards for students*	462	0.26	Thrill	74	4.69	4.43
31	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level*	460	0.34	Thrill	78	4.74	4.40
34	Bible / Religion curriculum*	406	0.25	Thrill	42	4.63	4.38
47	Accreditation*	139	-0.20	Frill	N/A	4.14	4.34
42	College prep curriculum*	369	0.15	Thrill	N/A	4.48	4.33
41	Safe learning environment*	370	0.25	Thrill	6	4.52	4.27
44	College in the Classroom program for college credit*	246	-0.04	Frill	N/A	4.20	4.24
20	Academically competent teachers*	560	0.70	Disgust	42	4.93	4.23
46	Fine arts program*	146	-0.23	Frill	N/A	4.00	4.23
40	Traditional values taught*	371	0.28	Thrill	12	4.49	4.21
23	Christian environment	544	0.48		16	4.66	4.18
45	TV media course*	209	-0.53	Frill	N/A	3.59	4.12
43	Results of standardized tests	269	-0.02	Frill	29	4.09	4.11
18	Individual attention provided for students	573	0.49		44	4.58	4.08
15	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	655	0.65	Disgust	4	4.72	4.07
9	Qualifications of teachers	692	0.68	Disgust	25	4.75	4.07
36	Small group Bible studies for students	379	-0.20	Frill	N/A	3.86	4.06
28	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	488	0.47		32	4.53	4.05
33	Educational vision for the school	436	0.32		41	4.37	4.05
14	Teachers are Christian role models	660	0.65	Disgust	4	4.68	4.04
26	Educational objectives are clear	499	0.50		35	4.52	4.02
24	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	518	0.46		29	4.46	4.00
6	Christian character development	728	0.77	Disgust	5	4.75	3.98
11	High behavioral standards for students	678	0.63	Disgust	27	4.62	3.98
19	Curriculum up-to-date	572	0.63	Disgust	29	4.61	3.98
25	Students feel accepted by their peers	517	0.45		39	4.43	3.98
10	Principal leadership	686	0.67	Disgust	18	4.63	3.97
27	Use of technology in instruction	498	0.36		61	4.32	3.96
38	School's use of resources	375	0.31		19	4.25	3.95
22	Teachers work well with parents	550	0.48		13	4.40	3.92
12	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	675	0.67	Disgust	22	4.56	3.89
1	Engaging teaching	833	0.88	Disgust	12	4.73	3.86
21	Parent involvement with school	554	0.50	Annoy	22	4.34	3.84
7	Individual student differences are accommodated	708	0.54	Annoy	41	4.37	3.82
39	Student admission standards	374	-0.08	Frill	21	3.71	3.80
5	Parent / teacher communication	739	0.67	Disgust	17	4.47	3.79
17	Staff is customer service oriented	627	0.49		14	4.22	3.73
8	Communication with constituents	704	0.64	Annoy	13	4.38	3.73
32	School Board oversight	448	0.18	Frill	22	3.90	3.73

37	Athletics Program	376	-0.11	Frill	N/A	3.61	3.72
35	Significant financial aid is available	380	0.35		41	4.07	3.72
4	Principal addresses parent concerns	788	0.87	Disgust	10	4.58	3.71
3	Key life skills are taught	792	0.75	Disgust	8	4.46	3.70
2	Discipline enforced consistently	793	0.88	Disgust	20	4.57	3.70
13	Reasonable tuition	671	0.61	Annoy	11	4.28	3.67
16	Financial stability of school	648	0.80	Annoy	14	4.14	3.34
Due to the small response size leverage was calculated using only factors 1 and 3 and the validity of leverage for this report is questionable.							



## Program Elements by Difference

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
2	Discipline enforced consistently	793	0.88	Disgust	20	4.57	3.70
1	Engaging teaching	833	0.88	Disgust	12	4.73	3.86
4	Principal addresses parent concerns	788	0.87	Disgust	10	4.58	3.71
16	Financial stability of school	648	0.80	Annoy	14	4.14	3.34
6	Christian character development	728	0.77	Disgust	5	4.75	3.98
3	Key life skills are taught	792	0.75	Disgust	8	4.46	3.70
20	Academically competent teachers*	560	0.70	Disgust	42	4.93	4.23
9	Qualifications of teachers	692	0.68	Disgust	25	4.75	4.07
5	Parent / teacher communication	739	0.67	Disgust	17	4.47	3.79
10	Principal leadership	686	0.67	Disgust	18	4.63	3.97
12	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	675	0.67	Disgust	22	4.56	3.89
14	Teachers are Christian role models	660	0.65	Disgust	4	4.68	4.04
15	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	655	0.65	Disgust	4	4.72	4.07
8	Communication with constituents	704	0.64	Annoy	13	4.38	3.73
11	High behavioral standards for students	678	0.63	Disgust	27	4.62	3.98
19	Curriculum up-to-date	572	0.63	Disgust	29	4.61	3.98
13	Reasonable tuition	671	0.61	Annoy	11	4.28	3.67
7	Individual student differences are accommodated	708	0.54	Annoy	41	4.37	3.82
21	Parent involvement with school	554	0.50	Annoy	22	4.34	3.84
26	Educational objectives are clear	499	0.50		35	4.52	4.02
18	Individual attention provided for students	573	0.49		44	4.58	4.08
17	Staff is customer service oriented	627	0.49		14	4.22	3.73
23	Christian environment	544	0.48		16	4.66	4.18
22	Teachers work well with parents	550	0.48		13	4.40	3.92
28	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	488	0.47		32	4.53	4.05
24	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	518	0.46		29	4.46	4.00
25	Students feel accepted by their peers	517	0.45		39	4.43	3.98
27	Use of technology in instruction	498	0.36		61	4.32	3.96
35	Significant financial aid is available	380	0.35		41	4.07	3.72
31	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level*	460	0.34	Thrill	78	4.74	4.40
30	Challenging educational curriculum*	461	0.33	Thrill	87	4.77	4.44
33	Educational vision for the school	436	0.32		41	4.37	4.05
38	School's use of resources	375	0.31		19	4.25	3.95
40	Traditional values taught*	371	0.28	Thrill	12	4.49	4.21
29	High academic standards for students*	462	0.26	Thrill	74	4.69	4.43
34	Bible / Religion curriculum*	406	0.25	Thrill	42	4.63	4.38
41	Safe learning environment*	370	0.25	Thrill	6	4.52	4.27
32	School Board oversight	448	0.18	Frill	22	3.90	3.73
42	College prep curriculum*	369	0.15	Thrill	N/A	4.48	4.33
43	Results of standardized tests	269	-0.02	Frill	29	4.09	4.11
44	College in the Classroom program for college credit*	246	-0.04	Frill	N/A	4.20	4.24

39	Student admission standards	374	-0.08	Frill	21	3.71	3.80
37	Athletics Program	376	-0.11	Frill	N/A	3.61	3.72
47	Accreditation*	139	-0.20	Frill	N/A	4.14	4.34
36	Small group Bible studies for students	379	-0.20	Frill	N/A	3.86	4.06
46	Fine arts program*	146	-0.23	Frill	N/A	4.00	4.23
48	Low student / teacher ratio*	100	-0.47	Frill	N/A	4.04	4.51
45	TV media course*	209	-0.53	Frill	N/A	3.59	4.12
Due to the small response size leverage was calculated using only factors 1 and 3 and the validity of leverage for this report is questionable.							

## Program Elements by Quadrant

Rank	Program Element	Leverage	Difference	Quadrant	Percentile	Importance	Effectiveness
7	Individual student differences are accommodated	708	0.54	Annoy	41	4.37	3.82
8	Communication with constituents	704	0.64	Annoy	13	4.38	3.73
13	Reasonable tuition	671	0.61	Annoy	11	4.28	3.67
16	Financial stability of school	648	0.80	Annoy	14	4.14	3.34
21	Parent involvement with school	554	0.50	Annoy	22	4.34	3.84
1	Engaging teaching	833	0.88	Disgust	12	4.73	3.86
2	Discipline enforced consistently	793	0.88	Disgust	20	4.57	3.70
3	Key life skills are taught	792	0.75	Disgust	8	4.46	3.70
4	Principal addresses parent concerns	788	0.87	Disgust	10	4.58	3.71
5	Parent / teacher communication	739	0.67	Disgust	17	4.47	3.79
6	Christian character development	728	0.77	Disgust	5	4.75	3.98
9	Qualifications of teachers	692	0.68	Disgust	25	4.75	4.07
10	Principal leadership	686	0.67	Disgust	18	4.63	3.97
11	High behavioral standards for students	678	0.63	Disgust	27	4.62	3.98
12	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	675	0.67	Disgust	22	4.56	3.89
14	Teachers are Christian role models	660	0.65	Disgust	4	4.68	4.04
15	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	655	0.65	Disgust	4	4.72	4.07
19	Curriculum up-to-date	572	0.63	Disgust	29	4.61	3.98
20	Academically competent teachers*	560	0.70	Disgust	42	4.93	4.23
32	School Board oversight	448	0.18	Frill	22	3.90	3.73
36	Small group Bible studies for students	379	-0.20	Frill	N/A	3.86	4.06
37	Athletics Program	376	-0.11	Frill	N/A	3.61	3.72
39	Student admission standards	374	-0.08	Frill	21	3.71	3.80
43	Results of standardized tests	269	-0.02	Frill	29	4.09	4.11
44	College in the Classroom program for college credit*	246	-0.04	Frill	N/A	4.20	4.24
45	TV media course*	209	-0.53	Frill	N/A	3.59	4.12
46	Fine arts program*	146	-0.23	Frill	N/A	4.00	4.23
47	Accreditation*	139	-0.20	Frill	N/A	4.14	4.34
48	Low student / teacher ratio*	100	-0.47	Frill	N/A	4.04	4.51
29	High academic standards for students*	462	0.26	Thrill	74	4.69	4.43
30	Challenging educational curriculum*	461	0.33	Thrill	87	4.77	4.44
31	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level*	460	0.34	Thrill	78	4.74	4.40
34	Bible / Religion curriculum*	406	0.25	Thrill	42	4.63	4.38
40	Traditional values taught*	371	0.28	Thrill	12	4.49	4.21
41	Safe learning environment*	370	0.25	Thrill	6	4.52	4.27
42	College prep curriculum*	369	0.15	Thrill	N/A	4.48	4.33
17	Staff is customer service oriented	627	0.49		14	4.22	3.73
18	Individual attention provided for students	573	0.49		44	4.58	4.08
22	Teachers work well with parents	550	0.48		13	4.40	3.92
23	Christian environment	544	0.48		16	4.66	4.18
24	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	518	0.46		29	4.46	4.00

25	Students feel accepted by their peers	517	0.45		39	4.43	3.98
26	Educational objectives are clear	499	0.50		35	4.52	4.02
27	Use of technology in instruction	498	0.36		61	4.32	3.96
28	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	488	0.47		32	4.53	4.05
33	Educational vision for the school	436	0.32		41	4.37	4.05
35	Significant financial aid is available	380	0.35		41	4.07	3.72
38	School's use of resources	375	0.31		19	4.25	3.95
Due to the small response size leverage was calculated using only factors 1 and 3 and the validity of leverage for this report is questionable.							



## Satisfaction Quadrant

The “Thrill me,” “Disgust me,” “Annoy me,” and “Frill me” program elements, at least in terms of their impact on satisfaction and willingness to refer. Note that not all items are reported here. Some are too close to call, even for a computer.

## Understanding the Satisfaction Quadrants

What program elements thrill, chill, or frill the people at your school most in the position to know?

We ask your teachers, parents, volunteers and board to rate the importance and effectiveness of 40 standard variables, and typically a few of yours as well.

The satisfaction quadrants are determined as follows. First, any program element whose mean average score is greater than the mean of all items in importance will be either a “Thrill me” or a “Disgust me,” by virtue of its relative importance.

Likewise, items whose mean importance answers fall below the mean importance scores of every item are either an “Annoy me” or a “Disgust me,” again by virtue of their relative importance.

To determine whether an item is either positive (“Thrill me”) or (“Frill me”), the zDif score must be lower than  $-.20$ . zDif expresses the difference between the mean importance for an item less the mean effectiveness for that item. (The denominator is the standard deviation of all items.)

Likewise, negative items (“Disgust me” or “Annoy me”) will have a zDif greater than  $.20$ .

Practically speaking, using zDif scores this way expresses the difference between importance and effectiveness means in relative terms – relative importance of this item (compared to the rest) LESS relative effectiveness of this item (compared to the rest).

Using  $.20$  instead of zero eliminates program elements too close to call, even for a computer.

As a practical matter, for schools doing really well in satisfaction, we also have to eliminate program elements that end up on the “Disgust me” list if the actual difference (DIFF, not zDIF) is less than  $.50$ . Typically, items less than  $.50$  in DIFF are NOT problematic.

Both the  $.20$  rule and the  $.50$  rule mean that not every program element tested (both ours and yours) will show up in one of the quadrants. If it is a high leverage item, you should work to improve its relative effectiveness, so that it ends up on the “Thrill me” list.

These findings should be entirely consistent with the differentials which are reported in the next section.

## Program Elements Table

*Fix the “Disgust Me” factors first, and keep improving the “Thrill Me” elements. Do something with the “Annoy Me” elements, if you can. Find a volunteer for the “Frill Me.”*

### Very Important to Parents

#### Disgust Me

*Fail to fix these and create **Detractors***  
Engaging teaching (833, 0.88)

Discipline enforced consistently (793, 0.88)

Key life skills are taught (792, 0.75)

Principal addresses parent concerns (788, 0.87)

Parent / teacher communication (739, 0.67)

Christian character development (728, 0.77)

Qualifications of teachers (692, 0.68)

Principal leadership (686, 0.67)

High behavioral standards for students (678, 0.63)

Principal provides staff oversight and accountability (675, 0.67)

Teachers are Christian role models (660, 0.65)

Teachers exhibit care and concern for students (655, 0.65)

Curriculum up-to-date (572, 0.63)

Academically competent teachers\* (560, 0.7)

#### Thrill Me

*Do well here to create **Promoters***

High academic standards for students\* (462, 0.26)

Challenging educational curriculum\* (461, 0.33)

Students are well-prepared for the next educational level\* (460, 0.34)

Bible / Religion curriculum\* (406, 0.25)

Traditional values taught\* (371, 0.28)

Safe learning environment\* (370, 0.25)

College prep curriculum\* (369, 0.15)

#### Annoy Me

*Enough of these will turn perfectly good **Promoters** into **Passives***

Individual student differences are accommodated (708, 0.54)

Communication with constituents (704, 0.64)

Reasonable tuition (671, 0.61)

Financial stability of school (648, 0.8)

Parent involvement with school (554, 0.5)

#### Frill Me

*Program elements which you do well, but are not in the top 50% of Importance. These help less than Thrill Me’s above.*

School Board oversight (448, 0.18)

Small group Bible studies for students (379, -0.2)

Athletics Program (376, -0.11)

Student admission standards (374, -0.08)

Results of standardized tests (269, -0.02)

College in the Classroom program for college credit\* (246, -0.04)

TV media course\* (209, -0.53)

Fine arts program\* (146, -0.23)

Accreditation\* (139, -0.2)

Low student / teacher ratio\* (100, -0.47)

Done Poorly (Ineffectively)

Done Well (Effectively)

### Not Important to Parents



## Differentials

The average importance and effectiveness scores for all program elements, reported in difference, importance, and effectiveness order.

The table below illustrates the average Importance ratings as compared to the average Effectiveness ratings. The difference, between 4.39 and 4.02 is (.37) The best schools will have a “Quality Gap” near (.20), and the worst we have seen so far is (1.10). That doesn’t seem like much, but it’s the difference between a school in the top 10%, and a school in the bottom 10%.

<b>Overall Statistics on Differentials</b>		
<b>Mean</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>SD</b>
4.02	Effectiveness	0.24
4.39	Importance	0.31



## Differential Diagnostics

*“Two roads diverged in a wood and I -- I took the one less traveled by, and that has made all the difference.”* Robert Frost

*“Sometimes the road less traveled is less traveled for a reason.”*  
Jerry Seinfeld

*“One is sorry one could not have taken both branches of the road. But we were not allotted multiple selves.”* Gore Vidal

*“If you come to a fork in the road, take it.”* Yogi Berra

The fundamental purpose of Differential Diagnostics is to help you prioritize where to put precious time, money, and energy. This comes from knowing your areas of effectiveness, including your outstanding “home runs,” and knowing what is important to your parents. Within that positive framework, we share quality gaps -- areas to prioritize for improvement.

Keep in mind that the sets of tables that follow represent the same data, sorted in a different order. Here is an explanation of what each column heading means.

**IMP -- Importance.** The average of all answers to the importance ranking for this particular program element. (“How important is this element to you?”)

**Item -- The program element or experience tested.**

**EFF -- Effectiveness.** The average of all answers to the importance ranking for this particular program element. (“How effectively does the school do this?”)

**DIFF -- Difference (or Differential).** This is the result of subtracting the average importance score for an item from the average effectiveness score for the same item. The larger the number, the more parents value this element’s importance over your effectiveness in providing it. In other words, the larger the number, the more problematic it is.

In general, any DIFF score over .50 is a problem, and the worse DIFF scores are not more than 2 points on a 5 point scale.

**zDiff -- The difference of the average importance and effectiveness for a given item in Standard Deviation units.**

We simply determine the Standard Deviation of the averages of all importance items, and the Standard Deviation of the averages of all effectiveness items. Then, for each item, we determine the z score for both the importance, and the effectiveness, and subtract. This gives you a measure of how important and effective each item is, compared to all the other items.

You can mentally translate zDiff scores into percentile terms in the 0 to 1 range as 1 point equal to a quality gap of 34 percentile points. A 2 point zDiff score would be a quality gap of *at least* 50 points -- it probably is higher. (In other words, a zDiff of 2 would be analogous to an element with an importance percentile 80, with an effectiveness percentile of 30.

**Differentials - Table 13  
In Difference Order  
(N=56.1) - 1st Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.74	Engaging teaching	3.88	0.86	1.69
4.58	Discipline enforced consistently	3.72	0.86	1.84
4.57	Principal addresses parent concerns	3.73	0.84	1.76
4.13	Financial stability of school	3.35	0.78	1.93
4.75	Christian character development	4.00	0.75	1.24
4.45	Key life skills are taught	3.72	0.72	1.40
4.93	Academically competent teachers	4.25	0.69	0.81
4.74	Qualifications of teachers	4.08	0.66	0.85
4.46	Parent / teacher communication	3.81	0.64	1.06
4.38	Communication with constituents	3.73	0.64	1.13
4.62	Principal leadership	3.98	0.64	0.89
4.69	Teachers are Christian role models	4.05	0.64	0.82

**Differentials - Table 14  
In Difference Order  
(N=56.1) - 2nd Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.73	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	4.09	0.64	0.78
4.55	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	3.91	0.64	0.95
4.62	High behavioral standards for students	4.00	0.62	0.82
4.60	Curriculum up-to-date	4.00	0.60	0.76
4.28	Reasonable tuition	3.69	0.59	0.99
4.36	Individual student differences are accommodated	3.84	0.52	0.63
4.53	Educational objectives are clear	4.03	0.49	0.37
4.58	Individual attention provided for students	4.10	0.48	0.29
4.67	Christian environment	4.19	0.48	0.18
4.33	Parent involvement with school	3.86	0.48	0.48
4.47	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	4.00	0.47	0.34
4.53	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	4.07	0.47	0.26

**Differentials - Table 15  
In Difference Order  
(N=56.1) - 3rd Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.44	Students feel accepted by their peers	3.98	0.46	0.32
4.22	Staff is customer service oriented	3.76	0.46	0.52
4.39	Teachers work well with parents	3.94	0.45	0.33
4.33	Use of technology in instruction	3.98	0.35	-0.03
4.74	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	4.41	0.33	-0.48
4.77	Challenging educational curriculum	4.45	0.32	-0.55
4.06	Significant financial aid is available	3.74	0.32	0.09
4.38	Educational vision for the school	4.07	0.32	-0.22
4.25	School's use of resources	3.96	0.29	-0.22
4.50	Traditional values taught	4.22	0.28	-0.48
4.69	High academic standards for students	4.44	0.26	-0.74
4.64	Bible/ Religion curriculum	4.39	0.25	-0.74

**Differentials - Table 16  
In Difference Order  
(N=56.1) - 4th Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.52	Safe learning environment	4.28	0.25	-0.64
3.90	School Board oversight	3.73	0.17	-0.37
4.49	College prep curriculum	4.35	0.15	-1.02
4.09	Results of standardized tests	4.13	-0.04	-1.40
4.20	"College in the classroom" program for college credit	4.24	-0.04	-1.53
3.72	Student admission standards	3.82	-0.10	-1.32
3.60	Athletics Program	3.74	-0.14	-1.37
4.14	Accreditation	4.34	-0.20	-2.12
3.86	Small group Bible studies for students	4.08	-0.22	-1.95
4.02	Fine arts program	4.25	-0.23	-2.12
4.05	Low student / teacher ratio	4.52	-0.46	-3.13
3.57	TV media course	4.14	-0.57	-3.13

**Differentials - Table 5  
In Importance Order  
(N=56.1) - 1st Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.93	Academically competent teachers	4.25	0.69	0.81
4.77	Challenging educational curriculum	4.45	0.32	-0.55
4.75	Christian character development	4.00	0.75	1.24
4.74	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	4.41	0.33	-0.48
4.74	Qualifications of teachers	4.08	0.66	0.85
4.74	Engaging teaching	3.88	0.86	1.69
4.73	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	4.09	0.64	0.78
4.69	High academic standards for students	4.44	0.26	-0.74
4.69	Teachers are Christian role models	4.05	0.64	0.82
4.67	Christian environment	4.19	0.48	0.18
4.64	Bible/ Religion curriculum	4.39	0.25	-0.74
4.62	Principal leadership	3.98	0.64	0.89

**Differentials - Table 7  
In Importance Order  
(N=56.1) - 3rd Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.46	Parent / teacher communication	3.81	0.64	1.06
4.45	Key life skills are taught	3.72	0.72	1.40
4.44	Students feel accepted by their peers	3.98	0.46	0.32
4.39	Teachers work well with parents	3.94	0.45	0.33
4.38	Educational vision for the school	4.07	0.32	-0.22
4.38	Communication with constituents	3.73	0.64	1.13
4.36	Individual student differences are accommodated	3.84	0.52	0.63
4.33	Parent involvement with school	3.86	0.48	0.48
4.33	Use of technology in instruction	3.98	0.35	-0.03
4.28	Reasonable tuition	3.69	0.59	0.99
4.25	School's use of resources	3.96	0.29	-0.22
4.22	Staff is customer service oriented	3.76	0.46	0.52

**Differentials - Table 6  
In Importance Order  
(N=56.1) - 2nd Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.62	High behavioral standards for students	4.00	0.62	0.82
4.60	Curriculum up-to-date	4.00	0.60	0.76
4.58	Individual attention provided for students	4.10	0.48	0.29
4.58	Discipline enforced consistently	3.72	0.86	1.84
4.57	Principal addresses parent concerns	3.73	0.84	1.76
4.55	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	3.91	0.64	0.95
4.53	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	4.07	0.47	0.26
4.53	Educational objectives are clear	4.03	0.49	0.37
4.52	Safe learning environment	4.28	0.25	-0.64
4.50	Traditional values taught	4.22	0.28	-0.48
4.49	College prep curriculum	4.35	0.15	-1.02
4.47	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	4.00	0.47	0.34

**Differentials - Table 8  
In Importance Order  
(N=56.1) - 4th Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.20	"College in the classroom" program for college credit	4.24	-0.04	-1.53
4.14	Accreditation	4.34	-0.20	-2.12
4.13	Financial stability of school	3.35	0.78	1.93
4.09	Results of standardized tests	4.13	-0.04	-1.40
4.06	Significant financial aid is available	3.74	0.32	0.09
4.05	Low student / teacher ratio	4.52	-0.46	-3.13
4.02	Fine arts program	4.25	-0.23	-2.12
3.90	School Board oversight	3.73	0.17	-0.37
3.86	Small group Bible studies for students	4.08	-0.22	-1.95
3.72	Student admission standards	3.82	-0.10	-1.32
3.60	Athletics Program	3.74	-0.14	-1.37
3.57	TV media course	4.14	-0.57	-3.13

**Differentials - Table 9  
In Effectiveness Order  
(N=56.1) - 1st Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.05	Low student / teacher ratio	4.52	-0.46	-3.13
4.77	Challenging educational curriculum	4.45	0.32	-0.55
4.69	High academic standards for students	4.44	0.26	-0.74
4.74	Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	4.41	0.33	-0.48
4.64	Bible/ Religion curriculum	4.39	0.25	-0.74
4.49	College prep curriculum	4.35	0.15	-1.02
4.14	Accreditation	4.34	-0.20	-2.12
4.52	Safe learning environment	4.28	0.25	-0.64
4.93	Academically competent teachers	4.25	0.69	0.81
4.02	Fine arts program	4.25	-0.23	-2.12
4.20	"College in the classroom" program for college credit	4.24	-0.04	-1.53
4.50	Traditional values taught	4.22	0.28	-0.48

**Differentials - Table 10  
In Effectiveness Order  
(N=56.1) - 2nd Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.67	Christian environment	4.19	0.48	0.18
3.57	TV media course	4.14	-0.57	-3.13
4.09	Results of standardized tests	4.13	-0.04	-1.40
4.58	Individual attention provided for students	4.10	0.48	0.29
4.73	Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	4.09	0.64	0.78
4.74	Qualifications of teachers	4.08	0.66	0.85
3.86	Small group Bible studies for students	4.08	-0.22	-1.95
4.53	Facility allows for adequate learning environment	4.07	0.47	0.26
4.38	Educational vision for the school	4.07	0.32	-0.22
4.69	Teachers are Christian role models	4.05	0.64	0.82
4.53	Educational objectives are clear	4.03	0.49	0.37
4.75	Christian character development	4.00	0.75	1.24

**Differentials - Table 11  
In Effectiveness Order  
(N=56.1) - 3rd Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.62	High behavioral standards for students	4.00	0.62	0.82
4.60	Curriculum up-to-date	4.00	0.60	0.76
4.47	Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	4.00	0.47	0.34
4.62	Principal leadership	3.98	0.64	0.89
4.33	Use of technology in instruction	3.98	0.35	-0.03
4.44	Students feel accepted by their peers	3.98	0.46	0.32
4.25	School's use of resources	3.96	0.29	-0.22
4.39	Teachers work well with parents	3.94	0.45	0.33
4.55	Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	3.91	0.64	0.95
4.74	Engaging teaching	3.88	0.86	1.69
4.33	Parent involvement with school	3.86	0.48	0.48
4.36	Individual student differences are accommodated	3.84	0.52	0.63

**Differentials - Table 12  
In Effectiveness Order  
(N=56.1) - 4th Quartile**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
3.72	Student admission standards	3.82	-0.10	-1.32
4.46	Parent / teacher communication	3.81	0.64	1.06
4.22	Staff is customer service oriented	3.76	0.46	0.52
4.06	Significant financial aid is available	3.74	0.32	0.09
3.60	Athletics Program	3.74	-0.14	-1.37
4.57	Principal addresses parent concerns	3.73	0.84	1.76
4.38	Communication with constituents	3.73	0.64	1.13
3.90	School Board oversight	3.73	0.17	-0.37
4.45	Key life skills are taught	3.72	0.72	1.40
4.58	Discipline enforced consistently	3.72	0.86	1.84
4.28	Reasonable tuition	3.69	0.59	0.99
4.13	Financial stability of school	3.35	0.78	1.93



## Special Differentials Section

The average importance and effectiveness scores for all program elements, reported in difference, importance, and effectiveness order.

The table below illustrates the average Importance ratings as compared to the average Effectiveness ratings. The difference, between 4.63 and 4.45 is (.18). The best schools will have a “Quality Gap” near (.20), and the worst we have seen so far is (1.10). That doesn’t seem like much, but it’s the difference between a school in the top 10%, and a school in the bottom 10%.

<b>Overall Statistics on Differentials</b>		
<b>Mean</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>SD</b>
4.45	Effectiveness	0.12
4.63	Importance	0.20

**Differentials - Table 2  
In Importance Order  
(N= 14.8)**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.86	High behavioral standards for students	4.57	0.29	0.20
4.80	Academically competent teachers	4.40	0.40	1.29
4.80	Teachers exhibit care and concern	4.47	0.33	0.76
4.75	Christian character development	4.44	0.31	0.74
4.73	Engaging teaching	4.27	0.47	2.04
4.70	Use of technology in instruction	4.60	0.10	-0.82
4.60	Qualifications of teachers	4.33	0.27	0.83
4.60	Students well prepared	4.47	0.13	-0.25
4.56	High academic standards for students	4.56	0.00	-1.21
4.56	Safe learning environment	4.69	-0.13	-2.22
4.53	College prep curriculum	4.33	0.20	0.50
4.07	Music program	4.33	-0.27	-1.85

**Differentials - Table 4  
In Difference Order  
(N= 14.8)**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.73	Engaging teaching	4.27	0.47	2.04
4.80	Academically competent teachers	4.40	0.40	1.29
4.80	Teachers exhibit care and concern	4.47	0.33	0.76
4.75	Christian character development	4.44	0.31	0.74
4.86	High behavioral standards for students	4.57	0.29	0.20
4.60	Qualifications of teachers	4.33	0.27	0.83
4.53	College prep curriculum	4.33	0.20	0.50
4.60	Students well prepared	4.47	0.13	-0.25
4.70	Use of technology in instruction	4.60	0.10	-0.82
4.56	High academic standards for students	4.56	0.00	-1.21
4.56	Safe learning environment	4.69	-0.13	-2.22
4.07	Music program	4.33	-0.27	-1.85

**Differentials - Table 3  
In Effectiveness Order  
(N= 14.8)**

IMP	Program Element	EFF	DIF	zDIF
4.56	Safe learning environment	4.69	-0.13	-2.22
4.70	Use of technology in instruction	4.60	0.10	-0.82
4.86	High behavioral standards for students	4.57	0.29	0.20
4.56	High academic standards for students	4.56	0.00	-1.21
4.80	Teachers exhibit care and concern	4.47	0.33	0.76
4.60	Students well prepared	4.47	0.13	-0.25
4.75	Christian character development	4.44	0.31	0.74
4.80	Academically competent teachers	4.40	0.40	1.29
4.60	Qualifications of teachers	4.33	0.27	0.83
4.53	College prep curriculum	4.33	0.20	0.50
4.07	Music program	4.33	-0.27	-1.85
4.73	Engaging teaching	4.27	0.47	2.04



## Close Correlates

Which program elements most relates to other program elements in the effectiveness ratings of your parents. This report tells you that. Note that all these items are **HIGHLY CORRELATED** to one another.

## Understanding Close Correlates

Parents, teachers, board members, and current volunteers are asked to rate the effectiveness and importance of 40 standard program elements, plus any program elements which you added. The Close Correlate Report, which is based on effectiveness ratings only, tells you “which program elements relate to others” in the minds of parents.

In other words, what is most closely related to “Engaging Teaching” or “High Behavioral Standards for Students?” This is very helpful for you in understanding both areas of strengths, and areas of weakness.

As you can imagine, this varies from school to school, denomination to denomination, although we see patterns. (E.g. “High behavioral standards for students” often closely relates to “High academic standards for students.”)

The math itself is Pearson Correlates, which can range from -1.00 (perfect negative correlation) to +1.00, a perfect positive correlation. Statistically, anything over .60 is considered to be highly correlated. We report the top ten items over .60 (if there are 10 items) in the PDF reports which follows. The complete list of close correlates can be found in the Excel final report as well. The Excel version includes all correlates .60 or above.



## Top 10 Correlates by Program Element (Over .60)

### Academically competent teachers

Challenging educational curriculum	0.74
Qualifications of teachers	0.72
Individual attention provided for students	0.70
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.69
Bible / Religion curriculum	0.68
Christian character development	0.68
Curriculum up-to-date	0.67
High academic standards for students	0.67
Teachers are Christian role models	0.67
Safe learning environment	0.66

### Christian character development

Christian environment	0.92
Bible / Religion curriculum	0.79
Academically competent teachers	0.68
Discipline enforced consistently	0.67
Safe learning environment	0.64
Teachers are Christian role models	0.61

### Curriculum up-to-date

Results of standardized tests	0.73
Educational objectives are clear	0.69
Academically competent teachers	0.67
Qualifications of teachers	0.64
Financial stability of school	0.64
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.64
Key life skills are taught	0.62
Parent / teacher communication	0.61
School Board oversight	0.61
Educational vision for the school	0.61

### Educational vision for the school

Financial stability of school	0.72
Educational objectives are clear	0.72
Engaging teaching	0.67
Results of standardized tests	0.66
Low student / teacher ratio	0.66
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.64
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.62
Curriculum up-to-date	0.61
Use of technology in instruction	0.60
Principal leadership	0.60

### Bible / Religion curriculum

Christian environment	0.83
Christian character development	0.79
Academically competent teachers	0.68

### Christian environment

Christian character development	0.92
Bible / Religion curriculum	0.83
Academically competent teachers	0.64
Safe learning environment	0.63
Teachers are Christian role models	0.61
Discipline enforced consistently	0.61

### Discipline enforced consistently

Communication with constituents	0.69
Christian character development	0.67
Educational objectives are clear	0.65
High behavioral standards for students	0.61
Christian environment	0.61

### Engaging teaching

Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.77
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.73
Educational vision for the school	0.67
Individual attention provided for students	0.65
Academically competent teachers	0.64
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.64
Teachers work well with parents	0.61
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.60
Principal leadership	0.60

### Challenging educational curriculum

Academically competent teachers	0.74
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	0.62
High academic standards for students	0.60

### Communication with constituents

Discipline enforced consistently	0.69
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.61
High behavioral standards for students	0.61
Educational objectives are clear	0.61

### Educational objectives are clear

Educational vision for the school	0.72
School Board oversight	0.71
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.69
Results of standardized tests	0.69
Curriculum up-to-date	0.69
Teachers work well with parents	0.68
Discipline enforced consistently	0.65
Staff is customer service oriented	0.64
Student admission standards	0.64
Principal leadership	0.63

### Facility allows for adequate learning environment

Engaging teaching	0.77
Individual attention provided for students	0.73
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.71
Educational objectives are clear	0.69
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.67
Parent / teacher communication	0.64
Principal leadership	0.63
Teachers work well with parents	0.62
Educational vision for the school	0.62
Qualifications of teachers	0.61

**Financial stability of school**

Educational vision for the school	0.72
Use of technology in instruction	0.66
Curriculum up-to-date	0.64
Results of standardized tests	0.62

**High academic standards for students**

Academically competent teachers	0.67
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	0.62
Challenging educational curriculum	0.60

**High behavioral standards for students**

Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.71
Academically competent teachers	0.65
Discipline enforced consistently	0.61
Communication with constituents	0.61

**Individual attention provided for students**

Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.73
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.71
Academically competent teachers	0.70
Low student / teacher ratio	0.69
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.67
Safe learning environment	0.67
Teachers work well with parents	0.66
Engaging teaching	0.65
School's use of resources	0.64
Students feel accepted by their peers	0.63

**Individual student differences are accommodated**

Parent / teacher communication	0.73
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.71
Key life skills are taught	0.71
School's use of resources	0.70
Individual attention provided for students	0.67
Curriculum up-to-date	0.64
Engaging teaching	0.64
Educational vision for the school	0.64
Teachers work well with parents	0.63
Academically competent teachers	0.62

**Key life skills are taught**

Parent / teacher communication	0.73
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.71
School Board oversight	0.68
Results of standardized tests	0.64
School's use of resources	0.64
Academically competent teachers	0.63
Curriculum up-to-date	0.62
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.61

**Parent / teacher communication**

Principal addresses parent concerns	0.77
Teachers work well with parents	0.73
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.73
Key life skills are taught	0.73
School Board oversight	0.68
Students feel accepted by their peers	0.67
Parent involvement with school	0.65
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.64
Results of standardized tests	0.64
School's use of resources	0.64

**Parent involvement with school**

Principal addresses parent concerns	0.70
Parent / teacher communication	0.65
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.64
School Board oversight	0.62
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.60

**Principal addresses parent concerns**

Principal leadership	0.77
Parent / teacher communication	0.77
Teachers work well with parents	0.76
Qualifications of teachers	0.70
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.70
Parent involvement with school	0.70
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.69
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	0.69
Students feel accepted by their peers	0.68
School Board oversight	0.65

**Principal leadership**

Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.90
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.77
School Board oversight	0.76
Qualifications of teachers	0.72
Staff is customer service oriented	0.69
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.68
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	0.68
Student admission standards	0.67
Teachers work well with parents	0.66
School's use of resources	0.66

**Principal provides staff oversight and accountability**

Principal leadership	0.90
Qualifications of teachers	0.74
School Board oversight	0.74
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.70
Student admission standards	0.68
Staff is customer service oriented	0.67
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.67
Academically competent teachers	0.66
Teachers work well with parents	0.66
Results of standardized tests	0.63

**Qualifications of teachers**

Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.74
Academically competent teachers	0.72
Principal leadership	0.72
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.70
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	0.68
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.65
Curriculum up-to-date	0.64
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.61
Results of standardized tests	0.60

**Reasonable tuition**

Low student / teacher ratio	0.69
Use of technology in instruction	0.68
Significant financial aid is available	0.67
Student admission standards	0.63
Teachers work well with parents	0.62
Parent / teacher communication	0.62
Principal leadership	0.61
Results of standardized tests	0.60

**School Board oversight**

Results of standardized tests	0.79
Principal leadership	0.76
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.74
Educational objectives are clear	0.71
Key life skills are taught	0.68
Small group Bible studies for students	0.68
Parent / teacher communication	0.68
Student admission standards	0.67
Staff is customer service oriented	0.66
Teachers work well with parents	0.66

**Staff is customer service oriented**

Principal leadership	0.69
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.67
School Board oversight	0.66
Results of standardized tests	0.65
Educational objectives are clear	0.64
Teachers work well with parents	0.64
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	0.64
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.61

**Students feel accepted by their peers**

Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	0.70
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.68
Parent / teacher communication	0.67
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.64
Individual attention provided for students	0.63
Teachers work well with parents	0.62
Low student / teacher ratio	0.61
Principal leadership	0.60

**Results of standardized tests**

School Board oversight	0.79
Curriculum up-to-date	0.73
Teachers work well with parents	0.71
Educational objectives are clear	0.69
Student admission standards	0.68
Use of technology in instruction	0.68
Educational vision for the school	0.66
Low student / teacher ratio	0.66
Staff is customer service oriented	0.65
Principal leadership	0.65

**School's use of resources**

Significant financial aid is available	0.71
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.70
Principal leadership	0.66
Individual attention provided for students	0.64
Key life skills are taught	0.64
Parent / teacher communication	0.64
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.63
School Board oversight	0.61
Academically competent teachers	0.60

**Student admission standards**

Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.68
Results of standardized tests	0.68
School Board oversight	0.67
Principal leadership	0.67
Safe learning environment	0.67
Educational objectives are clear	0.64
Low student / teacher ratio	0.63
Reasonable tuition	0.63

**Teachers are Christian role models**

Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.69
Academically competent teachers	0.67
Traditional values taught	0.66
Christian character development	0.61
Christian environment	0.61
Teachers work well with parents	0.60

**Safe learning environment**

Low student / teacher ratio	0.69
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.68
Individual attention provided for students	0.67
Student admission standards	0.67
Academically competent teachers	0.66
Christian character development	0.64
Christian environment	0.63
School Board oversight	0.61

**Significant financial aid is available**

School's use of resources	0.71
Reasonable tuition	0.67
Teachers work well with parents	0.63
Parent / teacher communication	0.61

**Students are well-prepared for the next educational level**

Principal addresses parent concerns	0.69
Qualifications of teachers	0.68
Academically competent teachers	0.66
College prep curriculum	0.64
Challenging educational curriculum	0.62
High academic standards for students	0.62
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.61

**Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology**

Use of technology in instruction	0.75
Students feel accepted by their peers	0.70
Principal leadership	0.68
Teachers work well with parents	0.66
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.65
Staff is customer service oriented	0.64
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.62
Results of standardized tests	0.60

**Teachers exhibit care and concern for students**

Teachers work well with parents	0.74
Engaging teaching	0.73
Individual attention provided for students	0.71
High behavioral standards for students	0.71
Teachers are Christian role models	0.69
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.69
Academically competent teachers	0.69
Safe learning environment	0.68
Principal leadership	0.68
Facility allows for adequate learning environment	0.67

**Use of technology in instruction**

Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	0.75
Low student / teacher ratio	0.72
Reasonable tuition	0.68
Results of standardized tests	0.68
College in the Classroom program for college credit	0.66
Financial stability of school	0.66
Teachers work well with parents	0.64
TV media course	0.63
Individual student differences are accommodated	0.61
Educational vision for the school	0.60

**College prep curriculum**

College in the Classroom program for college credit	0.69
Students are well-prepared for the next educational level	0.64
Principal leadership	0.63
Principal addresses parent concerns	0.62
TV media course	0.60

**TV media course**

College in the Classroom program for college credit	0.65
Use of technology in instruction	0.63
Results of standardized tests	0.63
School Board oversight	0.62
Small group Bible studies for students	0.62
College prep curriculum	0.60

**Teachers work well with parents**

Principal addresses parent concerns	0.76
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.74
Parent / teacher communication	0.73
Results of standardized tests	0.71
Educational objectives are clear	0.68
Principal leadership	0.66
Individual attention provided for students	0.66
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.66
School Board oversight	0.66
Teachers are up-to-date on teaching methodology	0.66

**Low student / teacher ratio**

Use of technology in instruction	0.72
Individual attention provided for students	0.69
Safe learning environment	0.69
Reasonable tuition	0.69
Results of standardized tests	0.66
Educational vision for the school	0.66
Student admission standards	0.63
School Board oversight	0.62
Teachers exhibit care and concern for students	0.62
Parent / teacher communication	0.61

**Small group Bible studies for students**

School Board oversight	0.68
TV media course	0.62

**Fine arts program****Traditional values taught**

Teachers are Christian role models	0.66
Academically competent teachers	0.66

**Accreditation**

College in the Classroom program for college credit	0.63
---	------

**College in the Classroom program for college credit**

College prep curriculum	0.69
Use of technology in instruction	0.66
School Board oversight	0.65
Principal leadership	0.65
TV media course	0.65
Accreditation	0.63
Principal provides staff oversight and accountability	0.61

**Athletics Program**



## Appendices

Includes three appendices: (A) What do I do now, (B) Word of Mouth Calendar, Month by Month, (C) Understanding Promoters, Passives, and Detractors.

## What Do I Do Now? Training Promoters to Promote

### Introduction

*Word-of-mouth happens.* But who makes it happen ... and how?

Who? The tried and true, and always valid, method to track who makes word of mouth referrals is to ask prospective parents specifically who told them about your school. GraceWorks has augmented this with the new Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey, which uses Harvard customer loyalty expert Fred Reichheld's "ultimate question" to simply ask your school constituents if they are willing to refer.

Note the word *constituents*. Most Christian school leaders have to recalibrate their thinking that *who* is broader than current parents. Who will typically include past parents, donors, board, volunteer leaders, and hopefully, teachers and staff. Referral reward systems offering free tuition disconnect from this broader reality, and one other as well.

How? The other reality is that most word of mouth referral happens *with no external reward whatsoever*. That's good news, for two reasons. First, constituents who are not current parents don't need one month of free tuition to keep referring. Second, the *right kind of rewards* will increase your word of mouth effectiveness, because *no one else is doing them*.

In fact, the reason that "free tuition" referral reward systems work (minimally) is because *they remind people to make referrals*. It's not so much that your referrers lack motivation – they are motivated. In fact, for intrinsically motivated "true believers", large monetary (external) reward can actually be de-motivating. (Most educationalists know this, but they think marketing is some sort of alternate universe.)

Moreover – if a current parent has concerns with the quality of your school – will offering a month or two of free tuition motivate them to start referring? It's doubtful.

Plus, the other caveat that most schools won't do anything to thank or reward a referrer until months later, when a prospective parent enrolls or shows up on the first day of school. From a strict word-of-mouth

perspective, such a reward program completely squanders the opportunity to keep your school at the "top of mind" of a referrer. And it begs the question of whose job it is to "close" a new parent.

### Solving Three Problems Needed to Increase Your Word of Mouth Referral

To increase our word of mouth referrals, three problems must be solved.

**#1: The Top of Mind Problem.** First and foremost, we must help our referrers to remember to make referrals. Here the goal is regular, graceful reminders:

- (1) Regular thank you notes for good reason,
- (2) Regular notes for no good reason,
- (3) A monthly mailer,
- (4) Regular "good news" phone calls, or calls just to say "hi" or "thanks"
- (5) An occasional lunch, or "drop-by" visits.
- (6) Once or twice a year "party" with a touch of "referrers training" (below)
- (7) Emails with good news, helpful resources, or expressions of appreciation.

Anything that helps remind a referral source to keep making referrals will help. For example, the next time your secretary is preparing a general mailer, ask her to pull the letters from your promoters. You (or her) can write a personal note on these, something like: "Your continuing referrals of new parents to our school make such an important difference ... thank you from the bottom of our heart."

**#2: Recognizing When to Refer.** It's easy to make a referral when a new family tells our referrer that "*We are looking for a good Christian school ... do you know one?*" If you think about it, one implication of secularization in America is that this type of family will be increasingly scarce.

Instead, we will have families who have not (yet) decided for Christian education, families *who have wants and needs that ultimately will be better satisfied at your school than their current situation*. There are dozens of situations that qualify – some of which depend on the strengths of your particular school. Here are three examples of conversations you can easily imagine between co-workers or friends at a water cooler or a little league game:

“My child is lost in the numbers at his school. I’m so convinced, with a little more individual attention, Johnny could be earning “A’s”, but as it stands now, he had mostly B’s and two C’s. The way we fund public schools just stinks ... I hope the Governor’s proposal to reduce class size is passed through the legislature before it’s too late for Johnny.”

“The other day Johnny brought home one of his friends from school. I couldn’t believe it, a sixth grader with an ear-ring! And hair down to his shoulder! Johnny didn’t take it very well when I told him that this friend wouldn’t be coming to our house anymore. He openly defied me when I told him he needed better friends – He said “No way – Mom!” I don’t know what to do, I can’t even get a return call from the Guidance office at the school.”

“I want my child to be able to engage the world, but boy it sure is getting a little raw at his public school. I couldn’t believe some of the things he told me about from his biology class ... and you can’t imagine what they taught in sex education – for fifth graders. I think I’m going to the next school board meeting – this is getting ridiculous!”

Part of GraceWorks’ monthly mailer program is to highlight a problem like this, a problem that is typically solved by a private Christian school. Some of these problems are immediately obvious, such as the benefits of small class size. Others are less obvious, such as the improved college scholarship prospects of most secondary-level Christian schools.

We need to train our referrers to open the door – *just a crack* – for these new families to consider a private Christian school. One systemic way we can encourage this is to adopt a widely publicized “Educational Success Consultation” model. Here, one or more of the most experienced and educated principals or teachers at your school are willing to provide 75 to 90 minute consultations to practically any family with the sole purpose of solving educational problems any family in your community is having – *regardless of whether they are appropriate for, or admitted to, your school.*

(Note that this powerful idea forces you to rethink the role of your Admissions Director. Unless your Admissions Counselor/Director is

educationally well-qualified, you may put her/him in charge of the word of mouth referral program, as well as coordinating the enrollment process after a new family has reached a “yes” decision. In between the referral and ultimate enrollment, the educationally qualified Principal or Administrator, in this Educational Success Consultation model, guides the “not at all sure about Christian education” family to a “Yes” decision. )

(*However ...* the Principal or Administrator still has significant responsibilities related to Word of Mouth, from phone calls to thank you notes to presence at word of mouth increasing events. On many occasions, there is simply no substitute for the Principal – end of discussion!)

### **#3: Learning How to Make an Effective Referral.**

The usual way a referral is made is that the referrer suggests to the new family “why don’t you call XYZ school. They’ve been just fabulous for my kids ....” Sometimes the new family does call – often they do not.

What you really need is for the referrer to say something like “With what you’ve described, Dr. Jones at XYZ Christian school will be able to help. He has over 30 years of education experience ... and I personally think he’s seen it all. He offers a 75 to 90 minute Educational Success Consultation to help families develop effective strategies to solve their children’s educational problems. Would it be OK if I had them call you to set up an appointment with Dr. Jones?”

Then, we need the referrer to immediately pick up the phone and call you, giving you the specifics – particularly a phone number. Kindergarten stuff, huh? But we have to teach, remind, even cajole our referrers to take this basic step.

Who is “you?” Good question. For larger schools, “you” is probably the Admissions Director. The Admissions Director makes sure that an appointment is promptly set, and that it actually happens. Very likely the Admissions Director is the most trained person to set these appointments.

In setting appointments with new families, work levels of authority – if a secretary or Admissions Director cannot get the appointment, have the principal call. (In other words, don’t start with the principal first in setting the appointment – who calls if he is turned down?)

## Promoter Training Events

What should you do at Promoter Training Events? With the above principles in mind, here are some ideas:

(1) Make sure people understand why they are here: “We invited you to this informal get-together because you are someone who is likely to make a referral to our school. Your referrals are the life-blood of this school, and this event is one way for us to express our appreciation.

(2) Have the Administrator or Admissions Director briefly explain the importance of word of mouth referrals. Get out the graph that shows that ninety some percent of your new families come from word of mouth referral. Each enrollment is worth \$5,000+ to your school – so many of the invitees are more valuable than most of your annual fund donors.

(3) Have fun! This would be a great time for an inspirational talk (10 minutes), perhaps by an alum or your Administrator being visionary. Sell the already sold with your success indicators (alumna success stories, a few test scores, “Christian” success indicators.

(4) Be sure to put something in their hands that they can read and review later. Remember, whether you get that appointment in the end will largely be decided by what the referrer says – not your magnificent appointment-setting skills. So give your referrers even more ammo.

(5) Spend 10 minutes talking about the dynamic of families who need Christian education, but are undecided. What does a family like that look like? If your group is fairly vocal, have them tell stories where this happened ... or brainstorm family situations. In other words, help your referrers be alert to situations where your school is a good solution to a problem ... *what are those problems?*

(6) Introduce, or remind referrers about, the “Educational Success Consultation” model you are adopting. (Obviously don’t do this until you are ready.) Make sure you are absolutely clear how this is going to work, particularly who the referrer should call. This is also a good time to explain what the difference between a good referral and a bad referral. (A bad referral is the one you don’t know about!)

(7) Do NOT talk about rewards for referrals. Surprise ‘em! (It’s far more rewarding.) Don’t even say that you will be doing events like this in the future – even though you will.

(8) Remember to incorporate ideas from the Word of Mouth Calendar.

For the psychologically astute, you are going to use an intermittent positive reward system with your referrers, which is the most powerful. In other words, keep ‘em guessing whether or not they’ll get a piece of cheese at the tunnel!

## Concluding Thoughts

One of the basic thoughts for word of mouth effectiveness is *we have to ask for it, often* -- but not blatantly. That’s why all the subtle activities: the notes, the calls, the events. And in a high tech world, please don’t immediately default to email. If anything, personal notes and phone calls are even more motivational than they were in the past.

Finally, it should be clear that we can purposefully increase our word of mouth referrals. In contrast to the usual thinking, there is plenty we can do. Your basic goal should be to increase the sheer number of referrals, regardless of the relative percent of referrals compared to other sources. Noble ideals of “balanced promotional strategies” are silly in a world where advertisers barrage the average person with 3,000 promotional messages a day, spending about \$850 per person per year for every man, woman and child in the United States.

If you had 90 word-of-mouth referrals this year, go for 200 next year, even if that means that 97% of all your new parents come from word of mouth. Let the others waste their money on print ads, branding awareness campaigns, and expensive advertising agencies caught up in the old ways.





# Word of Mouth Strategies Monthly Calendar PSRS 3.0

Dan Krause, President  
GraceWorks Ministries  
1802 Chapel Hills Drive, Suite F  
Colorado Springs, CO 80920-3714

719.278.9600

[www.gwmin.com](http://www.gwmin.com)

© 2011-12

## Ongoing

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
Administrator	Teachers / Staff	Story of superior parent / student service presented monthly	At staff training / meetings -- at least once a month				
Secretary / Graphic Artist	Everyone who receives literature	Literature includes the idea to make referral	"Our school thrives with families like yours -- so please tell a friend about our school."				
Secretary	Promoters / Warm Leads	Monthly mailer	GraceWorks is preparing proposal				
Administrator / Teachers / Board	Promoters	Thank you notes					
Administrator / Board	Promoters	"How are you doing?" phone calls					
WOM Team / Administrator / Volunteers	Promoters	"Good news" phone calls to Promoters	Especially Champions need to hear it from you before they read it				
Administrator / Board	Promoters	"Drop by" visits / coffees / lunches	Occasional -- 1 per year				
Administrator	All Constituents	Reminder at all group events: please refer to our school	"We are always seeking to serve families like yours -- that's why your referrals are so important."				
WOM Team	Promoters	Pre- or post-event reception					
Secretary	All Constituents	Notebook for educational professional family referrals	Have this widely available -- in the office, and with teachers				
Secretary	All Constituents	Bulletin board for people needing / selling / buying something	Culture of referrals				
Secretary	Anyone who requests it	Ongoing email announcements for people needing / selling / buying something	Culture of referrals				
Administrator / Marketing Team	Promoters	If someone gives a testimonial, make sure to get referrals	Train everyone to ask				
Administrator	Teachers / Staff	One success story per staff meeting	Reinforce the value and competency of your program with staff				
Administrator	Promoters	Thank you note immediately after receiving a testimonial					82

## Ongoing (con't)

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Administrator	All Constituents	Testimonial / success story in every newsletter					
Administrator / Principal	Champion Promoters	Bi-monthly insiders breakfast	1st something of the month				
WOM Team	Champion Promoters	Season pass free to all sports events	A special card of some sort				
Administrator / Principal	Current Parents	Suggestion boxes in several places	Tie into the "best idea" competition				
Administrator / Principal	New Parents	Nicest possible welcome packet	Sent as soon as possible after family is officially enrolled				
WOM Team / IT	Promoters	Special place for suggestions for improvement	A blog or "email your suggestions" here				
All Staff	All Constituents	Thank you notes for all thank yous received	Always look for an excuse to say thanks				
Administrator	Teachers / Staff	Customer (parent) service "mini-lesson" at every staff meeting	Teach both proactive and reactive customer service strategies				
WOM Team	Women Constituents / Community at Large	Determine what women's groups have ladies from your school and determine which to connect better with					
Administrator / Principal	Champion Promoters	Few friendly listening calls each month	Each Champion should be contacted every three months. Better: All promoters contacted every three months.				

# June

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Administrator / Principal	All literature; Website	Gather up credibility indicators	Testimonials, statistics, good news				
Administrator	Promoters	Here are the changes we made based on the PSRS and Yearly Parent	The most detail goes to your Champions				
WOM Team	Champion Promoters	Social networks survey	Ask your Champions -- what social groups are you involved with? Then target these.				

# July

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
WOM Team	WOM Foundation	Determine what action steps will be taken from GraceWorks plan					
Administrator / Principal	Current Parents	Summary results of Yearly Parental Quality Survey					
WOM Team	All Constituents	T-shirts -- message, design, order	Priority to promoters -- they will wear them				

## August

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
Administrator / WOM Team	Current Parents	Prepare mechanics / questions for listening tour	Or -- formalize the kinds of questions asked before and after school				
WOM Team	All Constituents	Review literature for "copier" friendliness	Plus "Please refer us" language				
WOM Team	WOM Foundational Research	Assign internet monitor for blogs, forums, list groups	Technorti, Nielsen Buzz Monitor				
WOM Team / Secretary	Promoters	Assemble distribution lists -- email and addresses -- for Promoters					
Administrator / WOM Team	All Constituents	Determine WOM messages	What you want people to say -- this is very important. What would prospective parents find interesting?				
WOM Team	WOM Foundational Research	Assign someone to deal with "Great Schools"	Too many prospective parents are looking at this -- it has to be right				
Administrator / WOM Team	All Constituents	Free tuition sweepstakes	Contest parameters; promotion				
WOM Team	Promoters	Determine WOM point person	Who is in charge of monitoring overall strategies and tactics?				
Staff	Marketing Team	Train staff on how to record WOM referrals					
Secretary / Graphic Artist	Promoters	School business cards	For the school as a whole -- include benefits				
WOM / Marketing Team	WOM Foundational Research	Define Persona(s) of ideal customer	Use to determine community experts / opinion leaders to attract				
Administrator / Marketing Team	Anyone who answers the phone	Telephone script / training	Lists positives of school, deals with common problems				
WOM Team	WOM Foundational Research	News junkie assigned to TV news and / or newspaper looking for WOM angles / ideas					

## August (con't)

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Administrator / Principal / WOM Team	Community at Large (buzz)	Determine community group involvements	Be involved selectively -- and significantly				
WOM Team	WOM Foundational Research	SWOT analysis of current WOM picture	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportu- nities, Threats				
Administrator / Principal	New Parents	First day of school phone call	Call next day or even the evening of the first day -- was everything OK? Is there anything you were wondering about?				

## September

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
Administrator / Marketing Team	Current Parents	Administrators structured listening tour	Or -- be available before and after school				
WOM Team	Community Groups	Speakers bureau					
WOM Team	Promoters	Promoters event	Three times per year, September, January, November are good. In December, you might do a very special Promoters event.				
WOM Team	Community	Identify / determine participation in community events	Such as Educational Fairs				
WOM Team	Promoters	Determine incentives for best Promoters	An automatic gift certificate may be counter-productive				
Marketing Team	Promoters	Special brochure that includes blank panel to describe own experience	Make sure that Promoters understand they are to write in the blank panel				
Administrator	Teachers / Staff	Identifying / Dealing with negativity	How to discover it, deal with it				
WOM Team	All Constituents	Develop a question for a bumper sticker / t-shirt campaign	"What is God's best for your child?"				
IT Department / WOM Team	All Constituents	Review printability / reproducibility of web pages	Add "email this page to a friend"				
Secretary	Current Parents	Business directory of current parents					
IT / WOM Team	All Constituents	Hold message with testimonials / achievement indicators					
WOM Team	Current Parents or Students	Best suggestion for improvement contest	\$1,000 cash award in March				
Administrator	Current Parents	Train staff on rewards for "negative time"	Thank you notes, gift certificate when we ask a parent to do something purely for our convenience				
WOM Team / Enrollment Team	Current Parents	Birthday cards -- either physical or spiritual	This would require you to ask this on the enrollment form				
WOM Team	Community at Large (buzz)	Determine Christian talk radio targets	And book them				



## September (con't)

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
WOM Team / Publications	Teachers / Staff	Business cards for all employees	Or at least all employees have a generic business card for the school				
WOM Team / IT	Teachers / Staff	A strictly staff only database or blog discussing parent / student service issues / concerns -- completely anonymous	A safe way for teachers especially to ask questions / discuss concerns. Administrator / Principal expected to read / comment / train on issues addressed.				

# October

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
WOM Team / Administrator	Promoters	Parent advisory group of Promoters					
Administrator	Teachers / Staff	Teacher / staff meeting about word of mouth	At least once a year -- GraceWorks can provide a new slideshow				
Alumni Relations Person	Alumni	Follow-up study -- are they still Christian?	80%+ of Christians lose their faith in secular universities				
Staff / Administration	Community at Large (buzz)	Determine community leaders who matter for your school					
WOM Team / Enrollment Team	Promoters	Determine who are your best 25 or so promoters and what special treatment they will get	Essentially, these receive "good news" first				
All	All Constituents	Revise vision statement to include WOM priority	"To become widely known in ____ as the school that ...."				
IT Department	Current Parents	Parents' blog	Moderator is very important				
WOM Team	Current Parents or Students	\$1,000 essay contest: "Why Biblical Values Matter Today"					
WOM Team	All Constituents	Business networking group to exchange leads	Group meets at the school				
WOM Team	All Students	Design a Christmas card contest -- \$100 prize	Judged / based on originality and creativity -- "out of the box"				

# November

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
Principals / Enrollment Staff	Prospective Parents	Review enrollment process to speed up the decision cycle	The quicker the entire enrollment process, the more students who will enroll				
Administrator / Enrollment Team	New Parents	Page / procedure for asking new parents for a referral	Which is clearly indicated to be optional				
Administrator / Marketing Team	New Parents	"Thanks for enrolling" packet / reward	Sent one week after enrolling				
Administration / Staff	Current Students / Parents	Special Biblical education book given out at quarterly conference					
Administration / Teachers	Current Students	Jesus Tattoo Day -- the most Biblical temporary tattoos you can find	This might be too controversial				
WOM Team	All Constituents	Print and send student designed card	At least send to all Promoters				
WOM Team / IT	Promoters	Special _____ Christian School screen saver	This might be hard technically				
WOM Team	Community at Large (buzz)	The sharpest Christmas light and display of any school in town	While public schools hardly celebrate Christmas, shine forth with the reason for the season				

## December

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Head of Marketing Task Force	Marketing Task Force	Ask for referrals at the initial meeting with brief training					
Administration / Staff	Current Students	Total surprise day	In December, kids show up & the entry way has been converted to the Bethlehem stable, with live animals				
WOM Team	Professionals in Community	Professionals' referral packet	Appropriate for clergy, learning disability specialists, counselors, etc.				
WOM Team	Champion Promoters	Champion Promoters Christmas Party	At a home -- Administrator or board member				

# January

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Current Parents	Community at Large (buzz)	Educational expert speaks at a Parent Forum					
WOM Team	Promoters	Promoters event	Or November instead				
WOM Team / Administrator	Current Parents	Letter: please make a referral	This goes with the postcards that can be forwarded. You could use the same mailing with Promoters.				
Administrator	Current Families	Offer family visioneering conference free for all parents	Vision planning / GraceWorks offers this				
WOM Team	Current Parents	Free tuition through end of year sweepstakes for randomly drawn family who puts "my child attends _____ Christian school" on their answering machine message	Or \$1,000 tuition reimbursement				
WOM Team	Current Parents and Promoters	Send forwardable postage paid post cards with the Administrators letter -- refer us to a friend	Preprinted on the front, with room on the back for a personal note by the sender				
WOM Team	Current Parents and Promoters	Key ring with _____ Christian School info	Put your mission statement on the back				

## February

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Administrator	Current Parents	Re-enrollment form includes request for referrals	Always optional				
WOM Team	Professionals in Community	Determine which community professionals could make referrals and visit	And visit them. This could start in January.				

# March

In Charge	Impacts Whom / What:	Idea	Comment	Agreed	Assigned To	Date Due	Date Finished
-----------	-------------------------	------	---------	--------	----------------	----------	------------------

## April

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Administrator / Secretary	All Constituents	Parent Satisfaction and Referral Survey (PSRS)					
Administration / Secretary	Current Parents	Booklet -- all your suggestions and what we are doing about them	Probably is selective				
WOM Team	Current Students	Student Appreciation Say	Do something that students would really like				



# May

<b>In Charge</b>	<b>Impacts Whom / What:</b>	<b>Idea</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Assigned To</b>	<b>Date Due</b>	<b>Date Finished</b>
Marketing Team	WOM Foundational Research	Identify great testimonials from PSRS	For everything - literature, web-site				
PSRS / Secretary	Promoters	Integrate PSRS promoters into main group	Cull / categorize referrers				
Administrator / Principal	Current Parents	Yearly Parental Quality Survey					
Administrators	Current Parents	Ask for referrals for non-detractors on Yearly Parental Quality Survey					
Administration / Staff	Current Students / Parents	Special Speaker: "God's Best for My Life"	Get a good speaker -- perhaps a Christian radio personality				
WOM Team	Current Parents	Parent Appreciation Day	Perhaps a concert or at least a potluck -- Principals and Administrator can dress up in tuxedos and welcome everyone				

## Understanding Promoters, Passives, and Detractors with JD Powers Customer Satisfaction Index (CSI) Equivalents

What do Promoters, Passives, and Detractors of your school look like? Here is a compilation of characteristics from Fred Reichheld's The Ultimate Question: Driving Good Profits and True Growth, Harvard Business Press, 2006, and Chris Denove and James D. Power's Customer Satisfaction: How Every Great Company Listens to the Voice of the Customer, Penguin Books, 2006.

The key question for the Powers' Customer Satisfaction Indicator (CSI) is "Overall, how satisfied are you with ...?" Like the Net Promoter Score (NPS®), the CSI question is often asked with a 0 to 10 point scale, with 10 being high. Instead of Promoters, Passives, and Detractors, J.D. Powers uses Advocates, Apathetics, and Assassins.

Scoring is slightly different, but the concepts are very similar.

<u>Degree of Loyalty or Satisfaction</u>	<u>Created by</u>	<u>Characteristics</u>
<u>NPS®</u> <b>Promoter</b> (9, 10)  <u>CSI</u> <b>Advocate</b> (8,9,10)	Schools that exceed parent expectations with consistent experiences of "wow"	Fiercely loyal to you, will suffer inconvenience to work with you, proselytizers -- actively sharing the "good news" of your school with others, will pay a premium for tuition; tend to help other school families, actively involved in volunteer activities. If unchurched, would consider joining your sponsoring church. Will consider outright philanthropic gifts to your school.
<u>NPS®</u> <b>Passive</b> (7, 8)  <u>CSI</u> <b>Apathetic</b> (5,6,7)	Schools that meet parent expectations -- no major problems, but no "wow" either	Will not tolerate large inconveniences, might pursue an ad or an email from a competing school; tend not to talk about your school either way, tend to approach your school as a consumer, more price sensitive. Tend to not volunteer or be involved in the life of your school. If unchurched, will usually not consider joining your sponsoring church.
<u>NPS®</u> <b>Detractor</b> (0-6 and no response)  <u>CSI</u> <b>Assassin</b> (0-4 and no response)	Parent feels a promise was broken, a commitment was unfulfilled, and has major problems with your school	Actively seeking out other schools -- and are actively encouraging others not to do business with you. According to JD Powers research, 50% more likely to tell someone the bad news of your school, compared to advocates telling you something good. They are much more likely to be complaining to the principal frequently.

© 2007

[www.graceworksministries.org](http://www.graceworksministries.org)  
719.278.9600

According to JD Powers and Associates research, the largest group of customers for most industries is the middle group, Passive and Apathetic -- often by ratios of 5 to 1. The most cost-effective way to generate word of mouth referrals is to develop strategies to move this group into the top group, Promoters and Advocates.

This requires finding ways to consistently exceed the ever-rising expectations of your parents.

Note that JD Powers will assess a service business, such as a school, with three basic types of questions: (1) overall service quality, (2) subjective experience of receiving the service (ie. the “niceness factor”), and (3) satisfaction with the process of deciding to have the service in the first place (ie. your enrollment process).

Translated for a Christian school, you could ask: Overall, how satisfied were you with ...

- the quality of the education your child received?
- your subjective experience of educating your child here?
- the process by which you decided to enroll your child at our school?