of clinical research via Clinical and Translational Science Awards core curriculum, mentorship, and an online seminar series. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: MCHS funded 4 key introductory research courses: 1) Manuscript Writing, 2) Grant Writing, 3) Basic Biostatistics, and 4) Essentials of Clinical and Translations Science Program. In addition to course offerings, a Research Interest Group was formed to guide novice rural researchers on topic selection and study design. This cultivated interest to create a 16month clinical research webinar series offering CME credits. Subsequently, an internal MCHS RFA was launched seeking earlystage investigator pilot proposals focused on rural health. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: In 2023, over 140 MCHS providers enrolled in 324 CCaTS research courses. This training led to the submission of 53 proposals to the inaugural MCHS 2023 RFA, of which 15 were awarded. Additionally, 14 MCHS extramural grants were submitted in 2023. Training efforts expanded in 2024 to include an online research seminar series covering various study topics and providing CME credit, with an approximate attendance up to 196 attendees per session. The second annual MCHS RFA resulted in 4 internal awards, with an additional 22 extramural grant submissions. These collective efforts have increased the number of MCHS first and last author publications and the number of providers with academic rank. DISCUSSION/ MCHS SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Leadership's commitment of resources to educate, mentor, and engage clinicians was crucial to our success and demonstrated a strong return on investment. To maximize impact in community-based practice, continued commitment is needed in the form of protected research time, funding, and research administration support of projects of interest

#### 172 Collaborations between translational science programs and academic health sciences libraries

Bart Ragon<sup>1</sup>, Sandra Burks<sup>2</sup>, Jill Deaver<sup>3</sup>, Emily Glenn<sup>4</sup>, Kristi Holmes<sup>5</sup>, Megan von Isenburg<sup>6</sup> and Elizabeth C. Whipple<sup>7</sup> <sup>1</sup>University of Virginia, integrated Translational Health Research Institute of Virginia; <sup>2</sup>University of Virginia Chair, Clinical, Academic, and Research Engagement; <sup>3</sup>University of Alabama at Birmingham Libraries, Lister Hill Library of the Health Sciences; <sup>4</sup>University of Alabama at Birmingham, McGoogan Health Sciences Library; <sup>5</sup>University of Nebraska Medical Center, Great Plains DIrector, Galter Health Sciences Library and Learning Center; Director of Informatics and Data Science, Northwestern; <sup>6</sup>University Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute (NUCATS) and <sup>7</sup>Northwestern University Duke University Medical Center Library. Associate Director of Informationist Services, Welch Medical Library; Indiana Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Collaborations between translational science programs and academic health sciences libraries can enhance research impact by improving efficiency, leveraging diverse professional expertise, and expanding opportunities for collaboration between librarians and translational science programs. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: A team science approach was utilized, integrating findings from a literature review, practical experiences of health sciences librarians, and collaborative writing. An analysis of case studies from institutions with successful partnerships explored the roles of libraries in partnering with translational science programs. The data collected were mapped to the Clinical and Translational Science Award Program's five functional areas outlined in the Notice of Funding Opportunity PAR-24-272. Librarians from 21 institutions engaged in discussions and collaborative writing to share insights and identify key factors driving successful partnerships. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Academic health sciences libraries play a crucial role in enhancing translational science programs through expert knowledge management, facilitation of research dissemination, and support for interdisciplinary collaboration. Results from this project include a table outlining 16 specific opportunities mapped across five functional areas and six topical categories for translational science programs and libraries to collaborate effectively.Successful partnerships demonstrate improved research workflows, increased interactions between researchers and libraries, and accelerated translation of discoveries into clinical settings. These collaborations illustrate opportunities for other institutions to adopt as they consider best practices in supporting translational science. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: By combining resources and expertise between libraries and translational science programs, these partnerships enhance the ability to transform scientific discoveries into real-world clinical applications, drive innovation, and amplify the contributions of both libraries and translational science programs.

#### 174

# Career Mentorship in Clinical Research Pathways in Medicine: UCLA Mentorship and Advocacy in Teaching Clinical Health-Related Research (MATCH) Program

Brisa Garcia, Diana Ambrosio, Gloria Moon, David Rincon, Sabrina Ghalambor, Madeline Mai and Laurie Shaker-Irwin University of California, Los Angeles

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: To assess the impact of the MATCH Program on mentees and mentors over the years, we have surveyed both groups on the effectiveness of the mentorship process, how the MATCH program influenced mentees' future career plans, and their ongoing interest in clinical research. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: To evaluate impact on mentees and mentors in the most recent cycle, we fielded two program evaluation surveys, for mentors and mentees. The surveys were distributed and collected using Qualtrics in May 2024. The mentee survey collected data on relationship with mentors, quality of mentorship, future career/education plans, and self-assessment of the program impact. The mentor survey collected data on relationship with mentees, mentees' engagement, and a self-assessment of the program impact. Qualitative analysis was conducted to determine key themes expressed by participants. The responses were compared to assess the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship from both parties. RESULTS/ ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Respondents included 15/20 (75%) mentees and 15/20 (75%) mentors. All mentees (100%) and mentors (100%) stated they would like to continue their relationship outside of the program. The majority of mentees 13/15 (87%) and mentors

13/25 (87%) also viewed their mentee/mentor relationship to be excellent or good. Most mentors 10/15 (67%) stated it was their first time serving as a mentor for the program. Mentees also found their experience in the program very beneficial with 6/15 (40%) stating that MATCH changed their career plans. In addition, most mentees 14/15 (93%) indicated that they are community college or four-year college/university bound. Most mentees 11/15 (73%) indicated an interest in pursuing a health or medical career. Also, 10/15 (67%) mentees stated an interest in pursuing a career in research. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Both mentees and mentors have benefited from the program's daisy chain mentoring and the program has helped facilitate a potential lifelong mentorship between mentees and mentors. The program also demonstrates promise of developing a pre-health pathway for historically under-represented students in STEM.

## The importance of interdisciplinary synergy in TL1 trainees – the University of Minnesota (UMN) model

Jayne Fulkerson<sup>1</sup>, Angela Panoskaltsis-Mortari<sup>1</sup>, Mary Maronde<sup>1</sup>, Sara Rohde<sup>2</sup> and Angela Merrifield<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Minnesota CTSI and <sup>2</sup>Independent Consultant

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The University of Minnesota's two-year TL1 program provides flexible and individualized education and training for a diverse cohort of scholars committed to pursuing impactful careers in clinical and translational science (CTS). The program aims to strengthen the nation's biomedical workforce by developing scientists skilled in clinical and translational research. METHODS/ STUDY POPULATION: The TL1 program recruits PhD candidates and postdoctoral fellows from a wide variety of graduate programs in colleges and departments across the University. To date, we have trained 26 predoctoral and 9 postdoctoral Scholars in 3 cohorts. Scholars represent dozens of disciplines and the full translational spectrum. These interdisciplinary cohorts are in a unique position to realize the fundamental characteristics of a translational scientist. Entrance/exit surveys and exit interviews provide program leadership with information for quality improvement and areas scholars believe contribute the most to their education and training in CTS. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Entrance/exit surveys indicated Scholar-perceived benefits of training in an interdisciplinary program, including growth in translational scientist characteristics (e.g., Boundary Crosser, Team Player). Exit interviews showed Scholars appreciated the cohort model bringing together trainees from many different research areas. They valued exposure to varied perspectives, talking through challenges and solutions with each other, and learning others shared similar issues. They valued the Scholar community they developed. Several felt siloed in their careers before the program and reported that TL1 participation connected them to others outside their own area of focus, expanded their knowledge about different research methods and revealed more pathways for translation. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Recruiting and training a diverse interdisciplinary cohort of pre- and postdoctoral TL1 Scholars promoted synergy in translational research, science skills and competencies, and transformed the perspectives of Scholars' views on the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration to accelerate science.

176

## Recategorizing SC CTSI's Online Educational Library using ACTS competencies for research professionals: Process and lessons learned

Nicki Apaydin<sup>1</sup>, Gordon Wimpress<sup>2,3</sup>, Elizabeth Burner<sup>4</sup> and Tamara Simon<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Southern California CTSI; <sup>2</sup>Southern California CTSI; <sup>3</sup>USC Alfred E. Mann School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences; <sup>4</sup>Southern California CTSI, Keck School of Medicine and <sup>5</sup>Southern California CTSI, Children's Hospital Los Angeles; Keck School of Medicine

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The SC CTSI's Online Educational Library (OEL) is a robust clearinghouse for educational content, containing approximately 250 videos. We outline the motivation, method, process, and outcomes for undertaking a massive recategorization of our OEL to better align the videos with applied skills necessary for clinical research professionals. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Our hub's robust workforce development and educational cores produce seminars, classes, lectures, and symposia that are recorded and repackaged for the OEL. The audience for our OEL includes research professionals from all stages of their career, such as research coordinators, research administrators, regulatory experts, biostatisticians, students, academics, investigators, community members, and others at our institution and globally. The content in the OEL was not efficiently organized and thus difficult for researchers to use. We employed qualitative content analysis to organize the videos in alignment with the eight competencies created by the Association for Clinical Research Professionals (ACRP), augmenting the competencies to best capture the content of and skills being taught in our videos. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: We refined the ACRP categories to best fit our needs and applied the categorization mechanism to approximately 250 videos. Our categories included communication, dissemination, and teamwork (45 videos), data management and informatics (27), ethics and participant safety (13), leadership and professionalism (24), regulatory and quality sciences (48), research and study conduct (44), research and study design (49), study and site management (54), and other (27). Some videos appear in multiple categories. DISCUSSION/ SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Detailing our approach and process will help other CTSAs harmonize their educational offerings to move toward a more unified method and process for organizing trainings and education in the CTR space and will better serve learners.

177

## The Indiana CTSI Postdoc Challenge: Catalyzing early-career success using experiential training in grant proposal writing and peer review

Thomas Sors<sup>1</sup>, Julie Driscol<sup>2</sup>, Perry M. Kirkham<sup>3</sup>, Joel Ybe<sup>4</sup> and Melanie E DeFord<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Indiana CTSI - Purdue University; <sup>2</sup>Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA; <sup>3</sup>Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA; <sup>4</sup>Indiana University School of Public Health, Bloomington, IN, USA and <sup>5</sup>University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: To strengthen postdocs' skills in developing and reviewing competitive proposals, advancing translational

175