are a variety of projects that require varying levels of commitment from researchers, which will be aggregated. This survey has been modified from a previously validated survey that focused on the demographic and linguistic characteristics of pediatric research coordinators. This survey will be emailed out to student research assistants and will be done over a period of 3 months. The study population will be predominantly undergraduate students who are all interested in a career in healthcare, ages expected to range from 18-25. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: We anticipate that the majority of student research assistants will be older students and will be students who identify as non-white/caucasian, as the majority of students volunteering at this free clinic do not identify as white. Additionally, we anticipate that students will feel that their racial/ethnic identity will positively impact their recruitment efforts. We also anticipate that the ability of a student research assistant to speak another language is expected to positively affect their perceived recruitment efforts. We also anticipate that gender will influence the student researchers' perceptions of their recruitment efforts. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: An individual's background can directly impact how they perceive their contributions towards research. Considering the paucity in research for underinsured and uninsured and the rise in undergraduate student research assistants, optimizing research efforts and SRA confidence is essential to increase the accuracy and efficiency of research.

Forming a Translational Operations Group: Bridging the

534

**Gap to Enhance CTSA Hub Operational Efficiencies** Shirley Helm, Lauren D. Harris and Deborah DiazGranados Virginia Commonwealth University

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: CTSA Hubs represent complex centers where teams work to meet multiple goals of the CTSA grant. An existing challenge is to work collaboratively across teams. To address this challenge, a Translational Operations Group (TOG) was established. Results show enhanced intra-hub collaboration and communication while reducing inefficiencies. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The TOG is composed of all CTSA hub module program managers who are charged with operationalizing vision into reality. The TOG was formed in 2021 as a mechanism to integrate new team members, provide connection, and improve cross-core awareness and collaboration. Leveraging team science principles, a team charter was developed outlining specific TOG aims and objectives. Collectively, shared goals were identified with establishment of group norms, effective communication pathways, shared resources and knowledge and meeting cadence. Leadership of the group rotates among the TOG members annually further engaging all TOG members. Pre and Post (one year) surveys were developed and provided to TOG members to gauge TOG effectiveness and perceptions of TOG members. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Survey results demonstrate the effectiveness of the TOG concept in promoting core/module awareness and goals, intra-core/module interconnectedness, and forming connections and integration into the CTSA hub ecosystem. Psycho-social questions demonstrated an increase in organizational self-esteem within the pre to post survey period in

relation to the specific TOG member's core/module and the CTSA hub as a whole. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: Formation of a TOG has been successful within a virtual environment where connection is challenging. Integration of members to the operational activities is critical to foster a positive work environment, reduce silo effects, and provide a space for sharing resources and knowledge. Annual reflection of priorities contribute to the ongoing success.

535 Translational science vs. translational research in CTSA pilot projects: characteristics and perceptions

Crystal Sparks<sup>1</sup>, Pamela Dillon<sup>2</sup>, Eman Ghanem<sup>3</sup>, Jasmine Neal<sup>4</sup>, Hardeep Ranu<sup>5</sup> and Margaret Schneider<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences; <sup>2</sup>Virginia Commonwealth University; <sup>3</sup>Duke University; <sup>4</sup>Ohio State University Medical Center; <sup>5</sup>Harvard Medical School and <sup>6</sup>University of California, Irvine

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: NCATS requires that CTSA-funded pilot projects focus on translational science (TS) and evaluate the translational process. However, a consistent understanding of TS remains elusive. This gap is being addressed by a consortium of 12 CTSA hubs aimed at identifying distinctive features of TS and translational research (TR) proposals. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: CTSA External Review Exchange Consortium (CEREC) is a reciprocal review collaboration among CTSA hubs. Reviewers were CEREC members from hubs that submitted CTSA applications (PAR-21-293); read the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) Clinical and Translations Science Pilot Module; and discussed TS with their hubs "a fair amount" or "quite a bit" and then they independently categorized proposals. Proposals were labeled TS or TR if reviewers reached a consensus on category assignment; without consensus, proposals were labeled unclassified. In addition to category assignment, reviewers commented about their classifications. R was used to evaluate the comments and create word clouds with phrases/ themes that distinguished between the categories of proposals. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Twelve CEREC participating hubs submitted 26 proposals, which were funded prior to the new NCATS TS requirements. Eight reviewers from distinct CEREC hubs evaluated and classified each proposal as TS or TR. Consensus (at least 87% agreement) was reached for 12 proposals, 6 TS and 6 TR. Reviewers provided comments describing the rationale for their classifications for 70% of the proposals. Qualitative analysis of the reviewers' comments and rationale by classification (TS, TR, or unclassified) revealed common themes within and differences between groups and shed light on what defines TS and TR. The most frequent themes that distinguished TS from TR were generalizability across multiple diseases and a focus on increasing research efficiency. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: NIH is focused on research that meets the new definition of TS. Investigators seeking to address this funding priority should explicitly state the relevance of their research to multiple diseases and to the acceleration of future research. Programs seeking to attract TS projects should instruct applicants to include this information.