**Excel Challenge Report**

1. *Given the provided data, what are three conclusions we can draw about Kickstarter campaigns?*
   1. Data Date distribution: Analysis of the dataset reveals that the number of campaigns were fewer in 2012 indicating that this was likely the time that the platform launched. Over the next few years the number of campaigns increased peaking in 2015 after which campaign numbers began to decline. Further analysis of the dataset over time reveals that in the early years (pre 2014) the percentage of successful campaigns versus failed campaigns was much higher than the period post 2014. This suggests that in the early year had fewer projects competing for funding leading to an increased likelihood of projects being successfully funded. As the number of projects increased as the platform became more popular, competition amongst projects to attract funding dollars increased leading to an increasing failure rate and a narrowing of the successful versus failed campaign outcomes.
   2. Size of Campaign goal: Analysis of the campaign fund raising goal versus the outcome shows that campaigns with fund raising goals of under$20,000 have a greater percentage of successful campaigns (vs failed or canceled campaigns). As the size of the goal increases the percentage of success begins to drop. For campaign with goals of between $21,000 and $45,000 the percentages of success and failure are roughly equal. Campaigns with funding goals greater than $45,000 have the lower percentage of success and are more likely to fail than succeed. The insight here is to keep funding goals small and focused to maximize the potential for success.
   3. Category/Sub-Category insight: Analysis of the dataset in terms of Category and Sub-Category indicates a few key findings:
      1. Most projects fall into one of three dominant Categories: Theatre, Music or Film/Video indicating that this funding platform attracts backers who favour performing arts type of campaigns.
      2. Within the most dominant category (the most listed campaigns) the Theatre Category the most successful and dominant sub-category is plays.
      3. Categories that most struggle to find success are Food and Journalism indicating that this particular funding platform doesn’t attract backers favouring those types of campaigns.
2. *What are some limitations of this dataset?*
   1. The size of the data set (approximately 4,000 records) is unbalanced. There are a few dominant Categories (e.g. Theatre, Film/Video, Music) that skew the population distribution as well as outcome distribution. A more balance dataset would likely lead to better insights about what drive a successful fund-raising campaign (irrespective of the type of campaign category).
   2. The dataset is also unbalanced with respect to geographic representation with 78% (3,196 out of 4,114) of the observations coming from North America. The largest single Country contributor is the US representing 74% (3,038of 4,114) observations.
3. *What are some other possible tables and/or graphs that we could create?*
   1. Pivot table & Chart of Outcome by country/region to determine if this type of fund-raising methodology is more successful in certain types or sizes of countries versus others. Does the size, geographic location/region or Political/Economic model of a Country/Region have an impact upon the success of a campaign?
   2. Pivot Table & Chart, Correlation and Regression analysis examining the impact/influence of Staff Recommendations upon Campaign Success. Does having your campaign recommended by staff increase likelihood of success?
   3. Examination of Campaigns by year and status using Pivot Tables and Charts to determine impact of seasonality and popularity of this type of fund-raising platform upon campaign success. For example, looking at this data set in the years prior to 2014 when the platform was new and had fewer campaigns, the percentage of successful campaigns versus failed campaigns was much larger than in the years after 2014. This speaks to how, as popularity of this site for fund-raising efforts increased, more projects overall were successfully funded but the success percentage dropped. This could be due to having greater competition from more projects for scare funding dollars results in a greater chance of a campaign failure.