

initiatives designed to impact clinical care. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** The benchmarking results helped MICHR identify goals for its production of Clinical and Translational Science to fill gaps in the field. Expanding the scope of this benchmarking project might achieve greater interrater reliability using larger representative sets of publications drawn from institutions across the CTSA Consortium.

176

### Translational Challenges and Facilitators of Health Equity Research Integrating Social Determinants of Health with Patient- and Community-Centered Technology

Boris Volkov<sup>1,2</sup>, Chris Pulley<sup>1</sup> and David Haynes<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Minnesota Clinical and Translational Science Institute; <sup>2</sup>Institute for Health Informatics, and Division of Epidemiology and Community Health and <sup>3</sup>University of Minnesota Institute for Health Informatics and Masonic Cancer Center

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** - Illustrate findings of a translational science case study of multi-pronged research aimed at understanding of social determinants in health disparities and integrating patient-centered technology; - Illuminate translational mechanisms by analyzing and sharing research challenges, facilitators, and benefits. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** Utilized novel TS evaluation methods and tools: - Translational Science Case Study protocol to examine translational path from innovation to practice, barriers and facilitators for that translational movement. - Translational Science Benefits Model (TSBM) Checklist for translational/research impact analysis. Triangulated diverse data sources: - Primary data: semi-structured interviews with research partners. - Secondary data: researchers' grant applications, reports, and publications; public stories/news related to their research; scientific publications; organizational/policy documents; and interviews with research stakeholders featured in published sources. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** Translational challenges include: culturally tailored education and outreach; data analysis and intervention planning; engaging community stakeholders in the development and implementation; addressing economic and resource-related challenges. Translational facilitators are: UMN CTSA funding and other support; access to data and resources; use of open-source materials; evidence-based/best practice approaches; diversity and collaboration between researchers, community organizations, healthcare providers; researchers' drive to translate. The research contributes to community and public health, clinical/medical, and economic benefits, health equity advocacy, catalyzing further research, and public awareness. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** The evaluation case study contributes to translational science by providing evidence and lessons learned related to translational benefits, challenges, and facilitators of community-based, patient-centered research bringing people, knowledge, and technology together and contributing to health equity.

177

### Placing Participant Experiences at the Center of Improving Research by Empowering the Participant Voice

Rhonda Kost<sup>1</sup>, Raneer Chatterjee<sup>2</sup>, Ann Dozier<sup>3</sup>, Daniel Ford<sup>4</sup>, Joseph Andrews<sup>5</sup>, Nancy Green<sup>6</sup>, Paul A. Harris<sup>7</sup> and Alex Cheng<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Rockefeller University; <sup>2</sup>Duke University; <sup>3</sup>University of Rochester; <sup>4</sup>Johns Hopkins University; <sup>5</sup>Wake Forest Health

Sciences University; <sup>6</sup>Irving Institute for Clinical Translational Columbia University Irving Medical Center and <sup>7</sup>Vanderbilt University

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** Empowering the Participant Voice (EPV) is a 6-CTSA Rockefeller-led collaboration to develop custom REDCap infrastructure to collect participant feedback using the validated Research Participant Perception Survey (RPPS), demonstrate its value in use cases, and disseminate it for broad adoption. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** The EPV team developed data and survey implementation standards, and specifications for the dashboard and multi-lingual RPPS/REDCap project XML file. The VUMC built a custom At-a-Glance Dashboard external module that displays Top Box scores (percent best answer), with conditional formatting to aid analysis, and response/completion rates. Results populate site dashboards, and aggregate to a multi-site dashboard for benchmarking. Results can be filtered by participant/study characteristics. Sites developed individual use cases, leveraging local infrastructure, initiatives and stakeholder input. Infrastructure and guides were designed for dissemination through public websites. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** Five sites sent 23,797 surveys via email, patient portal or SMS. 4,133 (19%) participants diverse in age, race, and ethnicity, returned responses. Sites analyzed their data and acted on selected findings, improving recruitment, communication and feeling valued. Aggregate scores for feeling listened to and respected were high (>90%); scores for feeling prepared by the consent process were lower (57-77%) and require action. Some groups experiences were better than others. Sites differed significantly in some scores. Dissemination of EPV is underway. Infrastructure and guides are downloadable free of charge, with advice from the EPV team. In 2023, a sixth site began piloting a lower literacy survey version and syncing data to the consortium dashboard. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** The EPV RPPS/REDCap infrastructure enabled sites to collect participant feedback, identify actionable findings and benchmark with peers. Stakeholders and collaborators designed and tested local initiatives to increase responses and diversity, address disparities, and discover better practices.

178

### Pace and Pitch: Predictive Factors for Seed Funding and Development

Alyson Eggleston

Penn State University TBD - please allow me to confirm team if abstract is accepted

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** Securing seed funding and external support can be a daunting process. Institutions are increasingly looking for quantitative assurance of impact and accountability. This study investigates factors predictive of seed funding selection, including pace of submissions as well as external support. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** Using Generalized Logistic Mixed Models (GLMMs), we model factors found to be predictive of researcher success, and model demographic factors as well, to understand the complex interplay of researcher background, professional networks and preparation, and researcher persistence. The following factors were modeled as potentially predictive of researcher success: faculty rank; co-PI; h-index; rate of application; prior award funding amounts; and research-focused social media posts. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** After effects are finalized, we expect that pace of seed fund applications and the strength co-PIs, as measured by h-indices, to be significant predictors of researcher success for

both securing seed funding and external support. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** This study identifies features associated with eventual research program success and can be used to support accountability and impact efforts at an institutional level. Research institutes strive to ensure equal access to these opportunities and train applicants to produce improved project proposals. Results from this study inform these efforts.

179

### **Clinical and Translational Researchers from Underrepresented Groups Identify the Barriers they Experience**

Judy A. Kimberly<sup>1</sup>, Stephen Kogut<sup>2</sup>, John F. Stevenson<sup>2</sup>, Anthony R. Hayward<sup>1</sup> and Meghan E. Tenca<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Brown University; <sup>2</sup>University of Rhode Island and <sup>3</sup>Advance RI-CTR

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** Using the NIH's expanded definition of underrepresented populations in the biomedical, clinical, behavioral and social science research enterprise, we examined the impediments for conducting translational research experienced by those from underrepresented groups. [[https://acts.slayte.com/calls/detail/740a13de-316c-11ee-90f4-0e0ce905385c/draft/389221c1-434e-11ee-90f4-0e0ce905385c#\\_ftn1](https://acts.slayte.com/calls/detail/740a13de-316c-11ee-90f4-0e0ce905385c/draft/389221c1-434e-11ee-90f4-0e0ce905385c#_ftn1)] #\_ftn1 **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** One hundred and ninety-nine people completed a survey distributed to 750 persons who had interacted with our Center's service cores as users, awardees, mentors, committee members, seminar attendees, and/or participated Center sponsored programming (response rate = 26.5%). The survey addressed barriers to conducting clinical and translational research at the respondent's institution, awareness of and interest in using specific Advance RI-CTR services, and satisfaction with their institution's efforts to support clinical and translational research. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** Women reported access to collaboration across institutions as a barrier to clinical and translational research that existed to a great extent (28%) significantly more than men (10%). More than half (53%) of the other underrepresented researchers surveyed identified insufficient grant administration support as a barrier that occurs to a great extent, compared with 35% of researchers who were not from an underrepresented group. Other barriers reported more frequently among underrepresented researchers included lack of pilot project funding, inadequate space for conducting research, lower access to collaborators across institutions, and difficulty obtaining advice on regulatory issues and commercial development. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** Efforts to address the barriers identified by underrepresented groups will include, but not be limited to, improving collaborations across institutions, support for grant administration, and a discussion of plans for the Center to augment and advocate at the partner institutions on behalf of these underrepresented individuals.

180

### **Building an evaluation platform to capture the impact of Frontiers CTSI activities**

Maggie Padek Kalman, Shellie Ellis, Mary Penne Mays, Sam Pepper and Dinesh Pal Mudaranthakam

University of Kansas Medical Center

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** In 2021, Frontiers CTSI revamped its evaluation infrastructure to be comprehensive, efficient, and transparent in demonstrating outputs and outcomes. We sought to build a

platform to standardize measures across program areas, integrate continuous improvement processes into operations, and reduce the data entry burden for investigators. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** To identify useful metrics, we facilitated each Core's creation of a logic model, in which they identified all planned activities, expected outputs, and anticipated outcomes for the 5-year cycle and beyond. We identified appropriate metrics based on the logic models and aligned metrics across programs against extant administrative data. We then built a data collection and evaluation platform within REDCap to capture user requests, staff completion of requests, and, ultimately, request outcomes. We built a similar system to track events, attendance, and outcomes. Aligning with other hubs, we also transitioned to a membership model. Membership serves as the backbone of the evaluation platform and allows us to tailor communication, capture demographic information, and reduce the data entry burden for members. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** The Frontiers Evaluation Platform consists of 9 redcap projects with distinct functions and uses throughout the Institute. Point-of-service collection forms include the Consultation Request Event Tracking, Annual Forms include a Study Outcome, Impact, and Member Assessment Survey. Set timepoint collections include K & T application, Mock Study Section, and Pilot grant application submission, review, and outcomes. Flight Tracker is used to collect scientific outcomes and integrated with the platform. Using SQL, the membership module has been integrated into all forms to check and collect membership before service access and provide relevant member data to navigators. All relevant data is then synched into a dashboard for program leadership and management to track outputs and outcomes in real-time. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** Since the launch of the evaluation platform in Fall 2022, Frontiers has increased its workflow efficiency and streamlined continuous improvement communication. The platform can serve as a template for other hubs to build efficient processes to create comprehensive and transparent evaluation plans.

181

### **Mapping Translational Research Collaborations: Insights from an IDeA Clinical and Translational Research Center**

Carlamarie NoboaU, Mariela Lugo Picó<sup>1</sup>, Luisa Morales<sup>2</sup> and Vicmag Cabrera<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UPR-Medical Sciences Campus; <sup>2</sup>Ponce Health Science University and <sup>3</sup>Universidad Central del Caribe

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** Policy makers are interested in understanding scientific collaborations that translate knowledge into population health. The objective of this study is to compare the translational research collaboration of the Hispanic Alliance of Clinical and Translational Research in 2020 and 2023 by using Social Network Analysis (SNA). **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** We conducted a systematic document review of all the Hispanic Alliance Calls for Pilot Projects from 2020 to 2023 including key attributes of the investigators and collaborators such as academic institution, highest degree, and collaborator type. Scientific collaboration was defined as two or more researchers working together in grant proposal for a pilot project application. Study data was recorded and tracked using an Excel spreadsheet. R Statistical software was used to analyze and map the networks resulting from collaboration interactions comparing the 2020 Call and 2023 Call. Network statistics were performed including nodes, isolates, edges, components, density, diameter, average degree, and the size of the main component.