leaders will have a tool to clarify intent and gain consensus as to which LHS model they want to implement and invest in.

518

myRESEARCHpath: an interactive roadmap for navigating research process, resources, and policies at Duke University

Jamie Wylie[1], Rebecca Brouwer[1], Derek Jones[1] and Sunita Patil[1]
[1]Duke University

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: In 2021, Duke University expanded the myRESEARCHsuite (MRS) of research support services with the launch of myRESEARCHpath (MRP), an interactive roadmap for navigating the project lifecycle. MRP integrates with the existing MRS services, which include a personalized research portal (myRESEARCHhome) and team of experts (myRESEARCHnavigators). METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: MRP was developed as a collaborative effort to centralize essential research-related information across Duke University into one location. MRP provides a web-based platform to integrate policies, processes, and resources from over 40 research support offices, organized into topic-based pages throughout the project lifecycle. Each topic-based page provides integrated guidance, categorized related resources, and contact information for personalized support from subject matter experts. Additional features of MRP include a curated search function, and filters that refine the topic-based pages and related resources to only those applicable to selected project inclusions and organizational unit. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Since the launch of MRP in January 2021 through the third quarter of 2021, 5,947 unique users accessed MRP for a total of 17,452 sessions. The most commonly accessed topic-based pages during this time period were: Activity disclosures (Other Support and Current and Pending) – 3,231 pageviews Animal welfare – 1,882 pageviews Proposal review and submission – 1,306 pageviews NIH research grants (R series) – 686 pageviews Proposal planning – 669 pageviews The most frequently searched terms (including spelling variants) were Other Support, Biosketch, NIH, and no-cost extensions. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: This data suggests users are accessing MRP for guidance on new or recently updated requirements. Maintaining clear, unified, and current site content should be prioritized to continue emphasizing MRP as a central location for research-related information. Duke also plans to explore further integration of MRP with the other MRS services.

519

The Research Unit Network (RUN) as a Learning Research System

Maran Subramain[1], Jackline M. Wangui-Verry[1], Kimberly J. Sprenger[1], Charity Ball[2], Janette L. Goins[3], Patrick B. Barlow[1] and Alejandro P. Comellas[1]
[1]University of Iowa and [2]University of Illinois at Chicago, [3]University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: CTRUs support clinical research. RUN is a Learning Research System that is created to enhance CTSA and non-CTSA research units capacity through implementing, assessing, and disseminating discoveries in methods, approaches, education, and training in clinical and translational science. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The RUN association began in July 2018 with eight universities. The association has grown to 44 hospitals, research, and academic institutions (including 36 CTSA institutions). A RUN Discussion Forum has been approved by the National Center for Advancing Science (NCATS) and utilized by RUN. The Discussion Forums are created with the goal of advancing CTSA Program objectives in high priority areas of clinical and translational science. RUN actively engages members through in depth scheduled monthly meeting discussions with various relevant topics regarding the development and evaluation of clinical trials metrics, benchmarks, and scholarly publication and presentation activities. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Topics covered in RUN monthly meetings include research units general budget guidelines, staff recruitment and retainment strategies, EPIC use in scheduling CRU research visits, and PPE for investigational drugs in context of USP800 requirements. RUN members vary in geographic location, type of clinical research (outpatient vs inpatient), resources, and research subject volume. They are engaged in online discussion and learning opportunities to improve translational science practices. A recent article titled "Impact of COVID-19 on Clinical Research Units (CRUs)" in JCTS is an example of best practices learned by RUN members and shared with the broader research community. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: RUN as a Learning Research System enhances clinical and translational research unit capacity and efficiency, encouraging collaboration to contribute with improving public health. This network is aligned with the CTSAs mission of developing innovative solutions to improve translational science.

520

CTSA Search Solutions

Barbara Tafuto[1], Riddhi Vyas[1] and Trish Pruis[2]
[1]Rutgers University and [2]Oregon Clinical and Translational Research Institute

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: CTSA Search Solutions (https://ctsa-search.rutgers.edu/search/) is a database that allows users to systematically conduct structured searches among the 60+ CTSA hub websites for information related to NCATS goals and CTSA hub activities. It was created with the objective of providing a novel process to evaluating and benchmarking CTSA hubs. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The CTSA Search Solutions database is an information tool that includes structured search terms relating to 3 main CTSA categories: NCATS goals, CTSA activities, and COVID 19 information. Subcategories from these topics were also identified and organized. Each CTSA hub website was systematically searched for content related to each of the identified terms and categories. The uniform resource locator (URL) for the primary webpage that provided content for each term was collected and stored in the CTSA Search Solutions database for user friendly access. URLs are validated monthly for changes or discrepancies. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: The final database includes access to 63 CTSA Hub websites with 89 structured search term options and over 800 links collected, organized, and published. Hub content can be searched by state, region, or even hub age to make detailed comparisons with the data identified. The CTSA Search Solutions tool allows researchers, administrators, evaluators, and community partners to find the needed links, to learn about specific CTSA hub program highlights as well as conduct research into program hub outputs and best practices across the nationwide CTSA continuum. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: On the most practical level, CTSA Search Solutions has the potential to help hub evaluators identify the content of hubs in their first cycle compared to those in their 3rd Cycle. It can help core leads determine common best practices.

It can help researchers understand the variety of COVID 19 outreach among the CTSA continuum.

521

Supporting research through the development of self-service tools and operational transparency.

Larisa Rodgers[1], Brian Ostasiewski[1], Lindsay Trost[1], William Ford[1], Michael Horvath[1], Irina Viviano[1] and Wendell Futrell[1]
[1]Wake Forest School of Medicine

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The Informatics Program in the Wake Forest CTSI is experiencing rapid growth. To accommodate an influx of both staff and clinical investigators this program Invests resources in self-service tools to increase researcher capabilities Automates resource intensive activities Creates transparency of operational processes for researchers. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Self-service tools (immediate/automated) The i2b2 tool queries clinical data for feasibility numbers and cohort identification; and provides demographic breakdowns of patient sets The Data Puller tool pulls identified patient data (with IRB approval) The SKAN NLP tool pulls aggregate numbers from over 3 million clinical notes Automation A custom-built tracking system automates parts of tracking requests for data and checking IRB protocols Operational transparency The Data Request Dashboard shows requesters information about their request and where it is in the process of being fulfilled The Data Quote tool was constructed leveraging the integrated CTSA informatics network and uses details of the request to estimate how long it will take to complete. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: i2b2 has had over 300 unique users each year; 80% are faculty or research staff, 20% are clinicians or students. From 2017-2021 there have been an average of 300 i2b2 queries and 45 Data Puller pulls each month. SKAN has had 58 unique users since its implementation in late 2020, averaging 5 new users per month. The automated data request tracking system took approximately 30 staff hours to create and saves an average of 4 hours of staff time per week. It also decreases human error by pulling/pushing information directly between systems. The Informatics program has received positive feedback from researchers who use the Data Request Dashboard. The Data Quote Tool is being used to give standardized quotes to researchers. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: Investing resources in developing and implementing self-service tools and operational transparency ultimately reduces overall resource consumption, saving staff and investigator time and effort. This enables the Informatics program to maintain a high standard of service while experiencing rapid growth.

522

Recruitment Optimization: A Strategic Approach to Integrating Recruitment Services through a Coordinated Multidisciplinary Team

Brenda L Hudson[1], Gina Claxton[1], Carmel Egan[1], Emily Hardwick[1], Michelle Shwery[1], Jason Bork[2], Waqas Amin[2], Angela Anderson[1], Sarah Wiehe[1] and Sharon Moe[1]
[1]Indiana Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute and [2]Indiana Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute, Regenstrief Institute

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Provide recruitment support via a coordinated application of strategic operations, participant engagement practices, and informatic capabilities best practices. Improve study success through the discovery of optimal recruitment practices, development of needed services, leverage of existing resources, infrastructure and guidance. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The optimization effort utilized a variety of methods for engaging participants and obtaining information related to the recruitment needs of study teams. Information was collected from an advisory board and through surveys of a diverse group of investigators and research coordinators examining recruitment barriers as well as current and possible future recruitment services. A workflow of the investigative teams recruitment experience was created to identify strengths, gaps and areas for improvement. This information was used to develop a set of recommendations for the Indiana CTSI leadership. Three pillars were tasked with tackling specific areas through an integrative and collaborative approach: (1) study planning and operations, (2) informatics, and (3) participant engagement and health literacy. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Key resulting recommendations included: creating a recruitment navigator to direct clients to the most appropriate service(s), adding a community engaged staff member and a digital public engagement specialist to the recruitment services team, redesigning the website navigations, creating participant payment guidelines, creating participant engagement principles guidelines, improving informatics support, and continual evaluation of best practices and innovations in recruitment support. An intake and follow-up survey were created for clients to assess services offered, those used, and ultimately the success of those services in improving recruitment measures. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE: The optimization efforts have shown a positive response from study teams demonstrated by an uptick of support requests. By taking an intensive strategic planning approach to streamlining recruitment services, the Indiana CTSI has leveraged existing resources to better serve clients in need of critical recruitment assistance.

523

The Development of an Institutional Study Start-up Tracker for Industry Sponsored Clinical Trials

Derek Jones[1] and Lindsey Spangler[1]
[1]Duke University

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Duke University developed a Project Tracker system to provide transparency into the complex study start-up process for Industry sponsored clinical trials. Partnering with process owners, investigators, research teams, and IT developers, we aimed to reduce timelines for IRB approval, Contract Execution, and Billing/Calendar setup. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: In 2019, a partnership of administrative stakeholders and IT developers began engaging with the primary populations involved in study start-up: research study teams (STs) and research administrators (RAs). A series of workgroups and feedback sessions revealed common themes with a slightly different scope: STs were interested in the progress of individual projects awaiting approval whereas RAs needed an aggregate view of start-up metrics over time and a way to help troubleshoot delays for individuals. Both groups were hindered by data captured across multiple systems, limited understanding of the entire approval process, and an absence of reliable indicators for delays or outstanding requirements. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: In mid-2021, we delivered a Project Tracker system