**Given the provided data, what are three conclusions that we can draw about crowdfunding campaigns?**

1. Campaigns tend to fail at a higher rate in August. July has one of the highest numbers of backers, which could mean people are less likely to donate two months in a row. It could also be that August is the hottest time of year, and people are in the lowest of spirits during this hot month, and therefore less charitable.
2. Campaigns trying to raise over $50,000 struggled to see successful campaigns with only a 36% success rate. This makes sense, as higher goals will always need a much higher engagement to reach that kind of goal.
3. Theater campaigns are the most numerous, but not always the most successful overall. We should look more into the technology campaigns to see why their success rate is the highest (not counting journalism, which only had 4 campaigns).

**What are some limitations of this dataset?**

Unfortunately, the data set does not give us the amount of each individual donation. This would have been helpful, because it would allow us to see if there was an outlier within the campaign itself that skewed the results of a particular campaign. Being able to look at the donation amounts of each campaign separately would significantly increase our understanding of why a campaign succeeded or failed.

We also don’t have the information about how the crowdfunding campaigns sought out donations. Were these online campaigns, booths, cold calls to donors, events…etc? How the crowdfunding was done could be a direct influence on the quality of the campaign’s pitch to doners and therefore how successful the campaign was.

**What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create, and what additional value would they provide?**

We could create graphs showing the effect of weather a “Staff Pick” or “Spotlight” had any effect on the percentage of Successful or Failed campaigns compared to the overall results.

I created a bar graph where the Count of Outcome was changed to the Percentage of Outcome by Row. This shows a very different visual result, because each category had differing numbers of campaigns.

From the graph where we show the number of successful campaigns, visually, it looks like the Theater category is the most successful because it is the largest. But when we look at each category split up beside each other, and measured by percentage, we can we get an easier visual on the success of each category type.
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We can also look at this data chart, showing how many people donated at what times of the year. This could help show us if weather, holidays or other outside factors contribute to whether or not people are feeling charitable.
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A COUNTIFS data set showing the number of donors and average donation size within each $10,000 goal segment would be helpful. This could help us see if the goal size of the donation effects how many donors the campaign got. The larger sized goals may garner bigger donations on average, because of how much is needed for the campaign, whereas a small goal may make donors feel like they only need to give a small amount to reach the goal. The amount a person will willingly give could change based on how much they assume each donor will need to give to reach the goal.

A COUNTIFS data set focusing on the campaigns that made over 100% of their goal. If we look at the data of the successful campaigns in 50% increments we could see the common traits of the most successful campaigns and get a better idea of what made them so popular.