Assessment Analysis

1. Traffic Analysis (10月数据 待定)

The Traffic of October is keep falling if we observe the data before October 11th and estimate the entire monthly data with it. The September traffic have a slight drop of 8%, and October keeps the trend. The estimated monthly UV is around 9498 while the monthly PV is slightly higher than 66000. The good news is the rate of dropping is slowing down, from 8% to 7%.

However, the October’s data is still much higher than June, which would be the start of stabilization if November and December’s data is still above 8000.
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1. Distinct session visits (10月数据 待定)

The number of sessions user visits is still rising, and the rough prediction of October’s data using the data before October 15th confirm the trend is steady and comforting. The rising trend starts in February 2020 and now the number is about 7 times bigger than the number in February. The rising of the trend is slowing down from September to October, which shifts from 18.2% to 4.74%, implies the trend is turning steady. Further data is need, and at the end of the year the trend would be clearer.

Comparing the UV change and Session count trend, one conclusion could be made: fewer people start to visit the assessment page while the users are viewing more sections. This is identical sign of the entire assessment have reached the end of its growing stage. There are fewer and fewer new users who are willing to take theses assessments, and the old users would not visit the old assessments they have finished once more. Further data is also needed for proving this trend in the next two months.
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1. Referral Traffic
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The overall referral decreased from August to September. Docs referrer, which means that the referral link is from Docs.Microsoft.com decreased for 9% percent, which is higher than traffic decrease. In comparison, referral link from external link and organic search increases. However, since they are about 1% of internal referral link, the overall traffic is still decreasing and this helps validate the previous conclusion: the link and the section is still healthy, it’s just reaching the middle of its life circle.

1. Conversion rate of each stage
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The visitor conversion rate of all history data of Assessment section is shown above. The Conversion rate of all visitors into pre-assessment is 76.9%, while only 53.84% of these users started the questions. During the test, 43.7% of the users stayed to the final, and only 32.6% of the users who finished the test clicked the recommended link. Comparing to the performance before June, the answered user rises from 35% to 41%, which is a relatively big success. Also, the user who finished questions also rises from 16% to 18%. Overall, the performance of assessment is rising.

1. Conversion Rate in three main sections

The conversion rate of each section is shown below separately. The participation rate of CJT and Strategy session is higher than AAR. The finish rate has the same situation. Considering the AAR contributes the major traffic, the answer is reasonable. The recommendation rate could not be calculated separately due to data structure. To sum up, the funnel implies the improvement of the latest version of Assessment.
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1. Performance of three different sections

The three main part of Assessment is Azure Architecture Review, Cloud Journey Tracker and Strategic Migration Assessment and Readiness Tool. However, due to the update of Assessment section, the CJT and AAR have new questions as well as new sections. For counting the UV throughout the history, we manage to count the old version as well as the latest version. The UV of AAR contributes half of the total UV, and CJT new as well as CJT old contributes 32%. For the record, the new CJT consists 23.2% of the total UV and the old CJT only have 8.8%——which means that the new CJT exceed the Strategy section single handed. The trend of this innovation is really going well.
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1. Chart, histogram
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Inside each section, there are different sets of questions which contains questions about different topic. The five old main topic of AAR: Cost, DevOps, Scalability, Security and Resiliency’s performance is above. The Completion of them is shown by the last bar, which is 50%, 75%, 80%, 68% and 38%. The performance is all relatively good except Resiliency which have a low finish rate. The new version of Azure, which consists of Cost, Operational, Performance, Security and Reliability, all have good performance on completion rate. The three new section (Operational, Performance, Reliability) have rate higher than 45%, and two of them are really high(>62%).

The rate is calculated by dividing the user count whose further reach is this specific question by the entire user who have start doing this part of assessment.
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Third part, in comparison, is new CJT. The complete rate becomes higher after the questionnaire shortened. The result proves that this revision of CJT is indeed an improvement.
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The last part, Strategy is just like CJT. The 42% completion rate of a 17 question-long quiz is also a good performance for a long quiz. Base on performance, the Resiliency part is the part that need to be investigated and fixed.
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1. Conversion Rate of each section
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The Blue Bar is the log10 of total score acquired in this section, and orange bar is log10 of total question answered. The log10 of user amount of these three sections is shown as the grey bar. The actual number is also printed below.

The lines are the Answer per User, which AAR is very high and CJT is the lowest; the Score per User which AAR leads the rest two; and Score per Answer which tells us that Strategic is the hardest part and CJT is the part which have the highest score per answer.

The conclusion matches the previous analysis.

1. Scoring of Different Questions

Due to the uncertainty of scores in database, the analysis choose the scores having “master” in QuestionChoiceKey as sample and ignored those users whose answers have null score in the system. The outcome could be revised after the new scoring data is finalized.
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The score was counted question by question in the recorded, and the statistics is given after data cleaning. Meanwhile, the orange dot and the line show the distribution of Score-per-User. The huge part of total score obeys the trend line of : y=0.0667x + 462.2, which implied the approximate relationship of y and x: x=15y. Comparing that with the distribution of Score per User, which is the orange line, the trend is confirmed: most of the orange dot is around 15, and some of the orange dot is around 5 (which is the outliers of blue dots). To sum up, the scoring distribution is divided into two groups: 15 and 5.

The chart shows more detailed information of scoring situation: the question of Cost category got the most total scores as well as large amount of User, which means that it is actually the most popular session. The other popular sessions are: Reliability, Security, Operational and Performance. The other part in AAR have relatively low scores. In fact, the new version of AAR is proven to be successful in Scoring aspect.
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The average score of CJT and Strategy is relatively low. Most of them stuck at the “5” part when we are looking at Scoring per User. The most outstanding Score per user happened in CJT category and Resiliency Category, which are no longer in the current CJT assessment. Strategy section have lower score and the one with highest SPU is also CJT.
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When evaluating the SPU, the highest in AAR is also cjt category. The second highest is Resiliency. However, when we are evaluating scores, it is not necessary that the higher score the better. The new AAR have not only relatively high SPU, but also higher total score as well as user. Comparing with the old version, a possible conclusion could be made: the old AAR is too easy for the users, because they have high SPU and low visit.
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1. Conversion Rate in different Device

The conversion Rate in each device give us a different perspective evaluating the performance of Assessment in different platform. Overall, the PC user’s conversion rate just about the same of the overall conversion rate previously presented. The users in other devices have somehow lower conversion rate each stage. The iPhone users have the lowest conversion for every stage, which implies some problem behind. iPad users have the closest rate comparing to PC users, and it makes us think about the reason behind. The most obvious reason behind this situation is that iPad have larger screen comparing with mobile devices. Does that mean the assessment is easier to take in relatively large screen? Based on common sense, the conclusion is yes, and that gives the Assessment team another challenge: could we improve the website on the phone so that mobile users could also have a good experience in taking the questions so that the conversion rate would be higher in the future?
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