culturalization/community engagement and will allow us to conduct a comprehensive yet practical evaluation of Miami CTSI programs.

A mixed methods analysis of hurdles to productivity among T and K awardees

Margaret Schneider, Lisa Jones and Amanda Woodward
University of California, Irvine

ABSTRACT IMPACT: Recommendations for increasing trainee productivity will be highlighted. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Using a combination of qualitative (interview) and quantitative (publications tracking) data, we undertook to describe the hurdles and concerns impeding academic accomplishments among T and K awardees at one CTSA hub and to examine whether hurdles at 6 months would predict academic output within one year following completion of the training program. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 29 trainees (28 TL1 and 8 KL2) 6 months into their training. Interview transcripts were analyzed using Atlas.ti to identify hurdles (factors that had already impeded research progress) and concerns (future challenges anticipated by the trainee). PubMed searches yielded the number of publications within one year of exiting the training program. Frequencies of hurdles and concerns were examined to characterize the factors most likely to impact trainee progress during the first 6 months of their training program. Among 18 trainees who had completed their training, the mean number of publications within one year of exiting the program (identified via verified PubMed searches) was compared across the total number of hurdles reported at 6 months (range = 0 to 3). RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: The thematic analysis yielded 19 categories of hurdles and 14 categories of concerns. The top three hurdles were technological challenges (e.g., issues with equipment or data reduction; reported by 63% of trainees), professional competing responsibilities (40%), and navigating collaborations (30%). The top three concerns were future funding (33%), potential as an independent researcher (27%), and institutional context (e.g., departmental structure; 23%). The number of hurdles reported at 6 months significantly predicted number of publications one year post-exit (F $(3,14) = 3.14$, p < .05). Trainees reporting zero hurdles generated a mean of 8.67 publications; those with 3 hurdles generated a mean of 2.4 publications. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: Future concerns were completely different from past hurdles, suggesting that the issues impeding research progress are not anticipated. Results suggest trainees would benefit from training related to how to balance competing professional responsibilities and navigate collaborations and that early attention to hurdles may enhance productivity.

Health Equity & Community Engagement

Retrospective Case Studies using the TSBM to Evaluate Translation Research Progress

Ingrid Philibert[1], Jolene Rohde[2] and LaKaija Johnson[3]
[1]Great Plains IDeA CTR, University of Nebraska Medical Center, [2]Great Plains IDeA CTR and [3]Assistant Director of Team Science, ICTR, University of Wisconsin

ABSTRACT IMPACT: This effort will ultimately improve both human and community health and translational science by showing the impact of CTR services on different types of projects that meet overall CTR missions and aims. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: CTRs seek to advance translational research to generate clinical, healthcare delivery, policy and community benefits. We conducted retrospective case studies for selected funded Pilot Projects for the Great Plains IDeA-CTR, focusing on facilitators and barriers to research translation and contrasting community-engaged and other proposals. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: We analyzed 8 CTR-funded projects (4 community-engaged (CE) projects and 4 other pilot awards) focusing on outcome domains of the Translational Science Benefits Model (TSBM): Clinical, Economic, Policy and Community Benefits as endpoints of successful research translation. We adapted an existing TSBM case study template for use with data required by NIH/NGIMS to map progress toward one or more TSBM outcomes. Using email, we posed three brief open-ended questions to investigators: 1) challenges/ barriers for the project; 2) how the CTR helped move research along and (how it could have moved it further); and 3) how research is progressing and how it could progress further. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: All investigators reported the CTR advanced their project. Non-CE projects appeared to have a more straightforward trajectory, with 2 investigators reporting no challenges and 2 reporting solely institution-internal ones. In contrast, the 4 CE projects reported both benefit from the engagement of the CTR (most prominently the efforts of the community advisory board (CAB) and community liaisons). Yet, they also reported some challenges beyond the CTR's ability to address, including delays in securing community buy-in and community buy-in of the investigator's research approach. Some barriers appeared beyond the CTR's current immediate ability to provide support to advance the project. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: Findings contribute to efficient approaches for retrospective case studies and emerging information on challenges and opportunities for CE projects. The study will help identify: 1) intermediate milestones and timelines for different projects; 2) advance data for TBSM endpoints; and 3) CTR activities that leverage the translational process.

Applying Community Health Priorities to the Translational Research Agenda

Jacquelyn Fede[1], Stephen Kogut[1], Anthony Hayward[2], John F. Stevenson[1], Amy Nunn[2], Julie Plaut[2] and Judy A. Kimberly[2]
[1]University of Rhode Island and [2]Brown University

ABSTRACT IMPACT: This work has begun to provide the foundation for better ensuring that translational research funded and supported by our IDeA-CTR grant is more directly addressing community- and stakeholder-authored health priorities. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: In order to effectively engage diverse, societal perspectives, we aimed to determine the relevance and feasibility of purposefully aligning translational research with health priorities adopted by the RI Department of Health, health-focused organizations, and community leaders. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Individuals from 27 community organizations in RI were asked, 'What are your health related goals for your community' and submitted responses online for 2 weeks. Participants generated 71 goals which they sorted into meaningful clusters and rated for importance and feasibility. Clusters were contrasted with RI health priorities to gauge alignment and saturation. In the next phase of this project, researchers and service users funded by Advance-CTR will be asked in routinely administered surveys how their current work may align with RI health goals and whether their future work can feasibly be connected to those priorities. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:

Using Group Concept Mapping software, the 71 health goals identified by community organization representatives were fit into an 8-cluster model. Results suggested highest importance placed on Accessible & Healthy Housing (M=4.12, SD=0.29), Community (M=4.08, SD=0.28), Youth (M=4.04, SD=0.49) and Mental Health (M=4.03, SD=0.46). State agency priorities were found to overlap substantially with clusters defined by community leaders. We expect researchers will rate clusters differently, and find some community-endorsed health goals more relevant to their work than others. Perceived feasibility of tailoring future research to state health goals is expected to vary widely by item and researcher. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: We intend to: 1) facilitate discussions about successes and challenges of translating community-authored priorities into research, and 2) foster better understanding between researchers and the communities they aim to serve on the role of CTR for addressing health challenges in the state.

Team Science

30718

Evaluating and advancing the CTSA external advisory board: Best practices

Joseph A. Kotarba, Lori Wiseman and Kevin Wooten
University of Texas Medical Branch-Galveston

ABSTRACT IMPACT: The goal of this evaluation study is to enhance the ability of the External Review Board to advise the CTSA at UTMB how to improve translational science activities. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The purpose of this study is to evaluate the work of the External Review Board (EAB) for the Institute for Translational Sciences/CTSA at the University of Texas Medical Branch-Galveston. This evaluation is conducted through the perceptions of professional and community board members. The outcome consists of an inventory of best practices. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: We collected data by means of semi-structured interviews with all eight member of the EAB. The interviews were conducted via telephone, lasted approximately 30 minutes each, and were audio-recorded with respondents' permission. Respondents' identities were held in confidence. The IRB at UTMB reviewed our study. The interviews were transcribed. The data were analyzed by means of an inductively-oriented, grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006). Emergent themes led to the formation of a series of best practices. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Common concerns included the need for more extensive training for new members; circulation of the agenda before the meeting; and the value of more structured main leadership. The members generally agreed that the breakout groups were valuable because they encouraged them to engage in hands-on responses to practical problems. One of the key epistemological findings was the consensus view that the evaluation of the EAB should be an ongoing project, as opposed to a yearly task. This serious approach to evaluation would be conducive to a process analysis of the EAB, since medical, social, economic, and cultural conditions surrounding and influencing translational science are generally in flux (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic and the various stages in the CTSA grant). Overall, the EAB experience was quite positive for them. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: The strongest sentiment expressed in the interviews was that the CTSA at UTMB should focus and build on its strength–the science of team science–as opposed to any concerted search for weaknesses that the term "evaluation" occasionally implies.

58201

What does team science look like across the CTSA Consortium? A qualitative analysis of the Great CTSA Team Science Contest results

Clara Pelfrey[1]; Ann Goldman[2] and Deborah DiazGranados[3]
[1]Case Western Reserve University, [2]George Washington University Milken Institute School of Public Health and [3]Virginia Commonwealth University

ABSTRACT IMPACT: This paper reveals the myriad techniques that CTSA hubs use to support, promote and expand team science including many ways to involve the community, students, scholars and other multidisciplinary scientists. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The Great CTSA Team Science Contest (GTSC) was developed in the NCATS Workgroup on Institutional Readiness for Team Science to collect stories describing the many ways hubs were promoting and supporting team science across the CTSA consortium. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Our qualitative data analysis examined the different designs from a high level - namely we categorized how many of the stories were competitions for pilot funding, training programs on team science competencies, communication skills training, workshops for educating community collaborators about research and/or training investigators about community-based research, advancing promotion and tenure for team science, etc. We discuss specific examples of different designs and who they were intended to benefit. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Launched in July 2018, the contest received 170 submissions from 45 unique CTSA hubs. Qualitative analysis addressed the following questions about team science: 1) Who or what group championed it? 2) Who benefitted or who were the intended recipients? 3) What was the desired outcome? (e.g. team science skills, communication skills, getting the community involved, fostering new collaborations, expanding capacity for team science, etc.) 4) What method(s) did they use? 5) What translational science stage was addressed? DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: This analysis includes examples of team science research, resources or interventions including successful team dynamics and knowledge integration. This paper reveals the myriad techniques that CTSA hubs use to support, promote and expand team science including involving the community, students, scholars and other multidisciplinary scientists.

Translational Science, Policy, & Health Outcomes Science

11989

The Impact of a Perinatal Mental Health Clinic on Psychopathology

Danielle Cooke
University of Florida

ABSTRACT IMPACT: This research is intended to provide researchers and clinicians information on factors that impact psychiatric health outcomes in a specialty perinatal mood disorders clinic. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The present study seeks to examine factors that impact psychiatric outcomes at the University of Florida