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

* Over 50% of all crowdfunding efforts were successful within the timeframe provided.

* Art related projects (theater, music, film & video) make up over 50% of all crowdfunding efforts with theater projects (and plays in particular) being the most frequent crowdfunded effort.
* Projects with a target fund size of $50,000.00 or more were more likely to fail than succeed at reaching their target funding. They were also the most likely projects to be cancelled prior to reaching their duration.

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

The dataset gives no indication as to the quality of the proposal on the website. For example, did the crowdfunding page include a video explaining the product or project goal? Did it link to an external website affiliated with the product in question? How long was the description of the product or project? It appears reasonable to believe that the quality of information being presented to a potential funder would impact how likely they are to fund the project. This dataset lacks that information.

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

* The most compelling line of inquiry would be the effect of staff pick and spotlight labeling on the likelihood of the project to reach its target funding. Spotlighting a project on the website could potentially be a paid promotional service of a website and demonstrating its correlation to a successful round of crowdfunding would likely increase the appeal of such a service to business or individuals who are using the website.
* It would also be useful to identify if a single company/individual has posted multiple crowdfunds, and what the success rate of these projects were. Did the outcome of the first project impact the likelihood of subsequent projects reaching their target?

**Bonus 2:**

* The median most likely serves as the more accurate representation of this data set. The mean is heavily skewed by very high levels of participation for a small number of funds which makes it less reflective of the broader data set. This is clearly an asymmetrical data set, and so the median is more useful with representing it.
* There is more variability in successful funding campaigns which seems like an intuitive result. A failed round of funding is naturally likely to trend toward a lower number of participants. This contrast with a successful fund which is naturally more likely to have a higher level of participation which would cause more variation in the number of participants.