|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Speaker | Average Strongly Agree | YouTube live streamers | Total YouTube views | Total YouTube Watch Time | Newsletter Opens | Newsletter Clicks | Clusters |
| Dr. Susan Gregurick | 73% | 26 | 501 | 40.2 | 163 | 9 | 2 |
| Dr. Roxana Daneshjou | 70% | 18 | 3,512 | 464.4 | 168 | 12 | 2 |
| Dr. Qing Zeng | 65% | 12 | 493 | 64.7 | 164 | 17 | 2 |
| Dr. Anna Baglione | 60% | 18 | 3,202 | 419.1 | 160 | 11 | 2 |
| Dr. Amy Yeboah Quarkume | 60% | 6 | 118 | 14.5 | 164 | 9 | 2 |
| Dr. Adam Yala | 60% | 14 | 286 | 31.4 | 183 | 15 | 2 |
| Dr. Brian Wright | 55% | 9 | 683 | 51.1 | 174 | 12 | 2 |
| Dr. Melissa Haendel | 55% | 12 | 137 | 12.8 | 157 | 8 | 2 |
| Dr. Prince Afriyie | 53% | 26 | 299 | 31.1 | 207 | 28 | 2 |
| Dr. Besa Bauta | 53% | 5 | 273 | 53.8 | 171 | 6 | 2 |
| Dr. Rafael Alvarado | 50% | 13 | 286 | 25.2 | 147 | 6 | 1 |
| Dr. James Zou | 50% | 12 | 1,293 | 143.8 | 147 | 8 | 1 |
| Julia McAuley | 40% | 9 | 372 | 25.9 | 161 | 12 | 1 |
| Dr. Chiara Sabatti | 40% | 3 | 159 | 5.7 | 160 | 9 | 0 |
| Dr. Don Brown | 40% | 9 | 105 | 7.2 | 165 | 6 | 1 |
| Dr. Daniel Katz | 40% | 5 | 105 | 9.9 | 153 | 10 | 1 |
| Dr. Steven Boker | 40% | 7 | 223 | 21.1 | 145 | 2 | 1 |
| Dr. Hudson Golino | 40% | 16 | 313 | 23.7 | 171 | 10 | 1 |
| Dr. Stephen Baek | 30% | 4 | 194 | 18.7 | 168 | 6 | 0 |

Table 1: Speaker Ranking

Table 1 above highlights the average strongly agree selected across four questions of participants in evaluating each candidate descending order. As an example, Dr. Susan Gregurick received on average 73% strongly agree when participants where asked the following questions:

1. I look forward to future scheduled presentations in the Biomedical Data Science Seminar Series.
2. The lecture provided a useful overview that contained valuable information I expect to leverage in my research.
3. The lecture was pitched at the right level for the varied professional backgrounds of the audience.
4. Many of the questions asked and answered by the speaker were helpful for clarifying points unclear to me.

Figure 1 below shows the results of clustering the speakers based on evaluation, newsletter activity following the speaker and engagement on YouTube. As you can see from the image below and in reference to the cluster labels in the table above there appears to be a rough grouping of high [red], medium [yellow] and low [blue] impact. We will use this information to further refine the selection of speakers moving forward.

Figure 1: Clustering of Speaker Engagement

A diagram of a speaker reviews

Description automatically generated

Table 2 below shows the standardized scores for each of the speakers across a variety of viewership measures. These include the number of viewers in real time, measures for impact on YouTube and data tracking the traffic through the weekly newsletter (No. of Opens/No. of Clicks). All these measures were set on the same scale between 0 and 1 then summed to generate the individual speaker impact scores seen in the fair right of the table. Some limitations in this process are related to the length of time that speakers YouTube videos were available online, as those that spoke earlier in the year are likely to have more views, total watch time and average percentage viewed. This is also true of the newsletter data but much less so as a large majority of the traffic in terms of clicks and opens happens the week following the lecture.

Table 2: Lecture Impact Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Speaker | No. Innovation Lab attendees | No. YouTube live | No. of Total YouTube views | Total Watch Time | Average Percentage Viewed | No. of Opens | No. of Clicks | Impact Score |
| Dr. Susan Gregurick | 0.25 | 1.00 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 2.29 |
| Dr. Roxana Daneshjou | 0.25 | 0.65 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 4.25 |
| Dr. Qing Zeng | 0.08 | 0.39 | 0.11 | 0.13 | 0.59 | 0.31 | 0.58 | 2.19 |
| Dr. Anna Baglione | 0.08 | 0.65 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.59 | 0.24 | 0.35 | 3.72 |
| Dr. Amy Yeboah Quarkume | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.54 | 0.31 | 0.27 | 1.27 |
| Dr. Adam Yala | 0.17 | 0.48 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.46 | 0.61 | 0.50 | 2.33 |
| Dr. Brian Wright | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.24 | 0.47 | 0.38 | 1.87 |
| Dr. Melissa Haendel | 0.25 | 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.36 | 0.19 | 0.23 | 1.45 |
| Dr. Prince Afriyie | 0.17 | 1.00 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 3.69 |
| Dr. Besa Bauta | 0.58 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 0.42 | 0.15 | 2.39 |
| Dr. Rafael Alvarado | 0.33 | 0.43 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.33 | 0.03 | 0.15 | 1.36 |
| Dr. James Zou | 0.67 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.30 | 0.47 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 2.44 |
| Julia McAuley | 1.00 | 0.26 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 0.21 | 0.26 | 0.38 | 2.23 |
| Dr. Chiara Sabatti | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.27 | 1.2 |
| Dr. Don Brown | 0.58 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.32 | 0.15 | 1.51 |
| Dr. Daniel Katz | 0.67 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.13 | 0.31 | 1.57 |
| Dr. Steven Boker | 0.58 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.17 |
| Dr. Hudson Golino | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.06 | 0.04 | 0.25 | 0.42 | 0.31 | 2.32 |
| Dr. Stephen Baek | 0.67 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 0.37 | 0.15 | 1.67 |

The Biomedical Data Science Innovation Lab also track social media engagement. The results are seen below in Tables 3 and 4. The results show steady engagement across platforms with peaks in the middle part of the year. The data also suggests that YouTube is by far the most popular platform for our program, which makes sense give that much this is where most of the content is posted.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 3: X/Twitter Post Impressions | |
| July | 1,977 |
| Aug | 328 |
| Sep | 407 |
| Oct | 2,435 |
| Nov | 2,098 |
| Dec | 2,442 |
| Jan | 3,361 |
| Feb | 1,084 |
| Mar | 1,915 |
| Apr | 1,289 |
| May | 258 |
| June | 1,996 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4: Social Media Impact | | | | | | |
|  | Twitter/X | Facebook | LinkedIn | Instagram | YouTube | MailChimp |
| Total Followers or Subscribers | 704 | 171 | 394 | 87 | 3,090 | 612 |
| Average Reach/Views | 1,666 | 361 | 369 | 122 | 2,016 | 167 |