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 in published sources. stakeholders featured 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>, Ranee 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 developcustom 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 hight (>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 UniversityTBD - 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 looks 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