

aim to identify factors associated with confidence in career progression and intent to continue clinical research training in UR post-doctoral fellows and early-career faculty. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** Building Up is a cluster-randomized trial at 25 academic institutions. In September-October 2020, 224 participants from the Building Up study completed the pre-intervention assessment, which included questions on demographics, science identity, mentoring competency, confidence in career progression, and intent to continue clinical research training. Using multinomial logistic regression controlling for gender and race/ethnicity, we identified factors associated with confidence in career progression, and intent to continue clinical research training. Statistically significant findings are reported. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** The cohort (N=219) is 80% female, 33% non-Hispanic Black, and 34% Hispanic. Having mentors that address diversity was associated with belief that career advancement is as open to them as anyone else (OR=1.7) and confidence in ability to overcome professional barriers (OR=1.4). Higher science identity (OR=4.0) and having mentors who foster independence (OR=1.7) were associated with confidence in ability to progress in career. Higher science identity was also associated with confidence in ability to overcome professional barriers (OR=2.2) and intent to continue studying biomedical sciences (OR=3.4). Being faculty (OR=3.8), higher science identity (OR=3.8), and having mentors that align expectations (OR=2.3) were associated with intent to continue clinical research training. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** These findings suggest that science identity and mentoring play key roles in confidence in career progression and intent to continue clinical research training. These factors are important to consider in retaining UR early-career biomedical researchers.

98

### Forging a New (Digital) Path: Designing a Strategic Pilot to Engage and Educate the Public about Clinical Research on Social Media

Nicki Karimipour, Suail Fabros, Andrea Diaz, Gordon Wimpress, Emily Lai  
University of Southern California

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** To conceptualize, implement and evaluate a three-pronged social media plan with goals to: 1) disseminate information about the Southern California CTSI and its activities on multiple platforms; 2) educate the public about clinical research participation; 3) use storytelling methods to spread awareness about research careers. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** We will start by creating a logic model to identify activities, outputs, short, medium and long-term outcomes of this social media innovation project, using CTSI and community stakeholder input (focus groups). This model will guide the creation of a comprehensive strategic social media plan that includes an editorial calendar for each platform, storyboarding and an operationalized narrative strategy, as well as KPIs relating to areas like reach, engagement, conversion, and sentiment. Collecting/analyzing these metrics will yield information about how the public feels about clinical research and will assist us in refining our content strategy. After completing formative research, we will create accounts on Instagram, TikTok, LinkedIn and Meta to complement our existing Twitter presence. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** We hope to identify which types of content lead to greater engagement and more positive sentiment on each platform, which will help us iteratively refine our

content strategy. Examples of content type can include: imparting research-related information, debunking myths, providing career information, etc. Through this process we will also gain knowledge about what methods are more appealing to our users, such as narrative storytelling. Visually, we anticipate learning about what types of multimedia content works best as a mechanism to disseminate information about clinical research (e.g. video, photo, audio, or a combination). **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** In a post-pandemic world of dis- and misinformation, it is more important than ever to disseminate trusted, vetted information about clinical research in novel and engaging ways. Through this initiative we will gather information, metrics and key lessons learned to present back to CTSA hubs to inform their short and long-term social media strategies.

99

### Grant Writing Program to Enhance Junior Faculty Research Funding Success

Jennifer Veevers<sup>1</sup>, Patrick H. Ryan<sup>2</sup>, Jacqueline M. Knapke<sup>1</sup>, Jason T. Blackard<sup>1</sup>, Stephanie Schuckman<sup>1</sup>, Brett M. Kissela<sup>1</sup>, Melanie T. Cushion<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Cincinnati <sup>2</sup>Cincinnati Children's Hospital, Medical Center, <sup>3</sup>Cincinnati Veterans Affairs Medical Center

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** The grant writing process provides investigators with critical thinking, problem solving, and communication skills, crucial for personal and professional development. However, opportunities for junior faculty to learn these skills are highly variable. Thus, we developed a grant writing program to assist in the preparation of an NIH R proposal. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** The R Club Grant Program was implemented in 2021 for junior faculty of the University of Cincinnati's College of Medicine and Center for Clinical & Translational Science & Training (CCTST). The program consists of a series of workshops (e.g., How to Craft a Specific Aims Page, How to Construct a Competitive R01 Proposal) utilizing examples of successful proposals and grant review criteria to demonstrate how to translate a conceptual framework into a research proposal (level 1). All participants can receive constructive feedback on a Specific Aims page from an experienced grant writer (level 2), and for a select cohort, the program provides comprehensive scientific content edits and iterative feedback on a full research proposal, with a focus on grantsmanship, presentation, and overall competitiveness (level 3). **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** Over three NIH grant cycles, the program to date has provided 38 early-career investigators with multi-level grant writing support. All participants attended the workshops and received supporting documents, 21 received feedback on a Specific Aims page, and 6 received one-on-one writing assistance on their full research proposal. Of the 6 investigators who received the greatest level of support, 3 have received NIH scientific review, with a 66.6% funding success rate for either an original (R01, n=1) or subsequent overlapping (R35, n=1) proposal. In a survey sent to workshop attendees, 100% of respondents (n=23) reported ( Strongly Agreed or Agreed ) that the training was a worthwhile investment in their professional development and 96% stated that they will be able to apply the knowledge and skills learned. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** Initial evaluation measures suggest that grant writing support programs have great potential to enhance funding success rates. As the program evolves it will be crucial to evaluate both qualitative and quantitative feedback measures to ensure efforts are directed to the appropriate level(s) of service to maximize the funding success of our faculty.