

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

91348

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

14179

Retrospective Case Studies using the TSBM to Evaluate Translation Research Progress

Ingrid Philibert¹, Jolene Rohde² and LaKaija Johnson³

¹Great Plains IDeA CTR, University of Nebraska Medical Center,

²Great Plains IDeA CTR and ³Assistant 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 TSBM endpoints; and 3) CTR activities that leverage the translational process.

25309

Applying Community Health Priorities to the Translational Research Agenda

Jacquelyn Fede¹, Stephen Kogut¹, Anthony Hayward², John F. Stevenson¹, Amy Nunn², Julie Plaut² and Judy A. Kimberly²

¹University of Rhode Island and ²Brown 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:**