Consultant Evaluation

* The audience/decision-makers were accurately identified.
  + Rachel correctly identified the audience, me as Mr. Schumann. Per our discussion, I was preparing an article discussing important things to consider when building a team, specifically regarding free agents and the draft.
* The script/slides fulfilled the outcome/output you described in the consultation session.
  + The slides were above and beyond what I expected. Rachel put in a lot of work relative to the ~1-2 hour expectation. The script matched the slides very well.
* The script/slides were professional/appropriate for your organization (as the client).
  + Yes, both the script and slides are appropriate. I especially liked the basketball theme Rachel added.
* Do you feel your needs as the client were met by the consultant?
  + My needs were more than met. Not only were the top variables identified, but Rachel also explained how they were identified. That is more context that I can convey to my readers.
* What were the consulting strengths of your classmate?
  + Rachel asked good questions. She tried to understand the situation on a deeper level. She wanted to know why I thought one thing was important as opposed to another. Why do you want to ignore this again? She took her time and absorbed the information.
* Were there areas the consultant's work/output could be improved? If so, where/how?
  + The only thing I might suggest is to display the variables’ positive and negative impact on the model in the slides. Intuitively, more turnovers would be bad. But seeing turnovers at the top of the priority list can be confusing without that dash of context, especially if you glance at the slides before you read the script like me.
* Would you hire the consultant as a data scientist? Why or why not?
  + I would hire Rachel. She showed me that she’s willing to do much more work than the minimum. She can also present complicated ideas in a way that a non-data person can understand.