Q1. “Even a 2 percent drop nationwide would dwarf what his team had spent thus far in developing the tool.” This explains it. They need to know if the tool will help or hinder agents.

Q2. Since the sales process was the fourth or fifth most important factor that influenced sales, the team would have to be careful when selecting where to roll it out. They were looking for states with similar seasonal sales volume and growth rates. They identified 20 potential participants. They did this so they could compare the results of the control and treatment on equal grounds.

Q3.

Pros:

* Good experiment; comparing like groups to yield comparable results

Cons:

* Baseline and Control Baseline are the average of past 12 weeks which could give a misleading conclusion
* Averaged control group, why? If we are soloing out treatment states why not do the same for control states?

I would have made sure to compare states’ on the exact same data. Not averages versus individual results. Same goes for Baseline and Control Baseline. I would start the experiment using week 36 to compare against along with data on historical change in sales at this time of year.

Q4. In .ppt file

Q5. I’m feeling good about the data we are receiving. There are no inflection points but every week we can see the Advisor Pro agents are always performing higher. This would be a green flag for me.

Q6. Sands should continue to test Advisor Pro as it seems to increase average number of applications received by about .9 per month. We need to do further testing to identify causation.