and 60 included no central actor on the team. In the latter group, more PIs were clinical faculty and fewer were full professors. Network analysis of affiliating departments showed that Medicine was the prominent actor in the central actors group, while the network of no-central actor group was more fragmented with Neurology as central. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: Widely recognized researchers are more likely to collaborate with each other in bridging studies possibly marginalizing less experienced peers. Bridging grants led by less central researchers, often clinician-scientists, may thrive where supportive culture and departmental facilities exist.

Health Equity & Community Engagement

83678

Bridging Gaps to Equalize Community-Academic Partnership: A Comparison of Capacities With Research Needs Across CTSA Program Hubs

Bonnie Spring, David Moskowitz, Angela F. Pfammatter, Ruchi Patel, Hannah Rumsey
Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine

ABSTRACT IMPACT: Our research identifies key opportunities for increased cross-CTSA collaboration, as a means to improve community-research cooperation and better CBPR practices. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Currently, team science training prioritizes developing the collaborative competencies of interdisciplinary scientists to work with each other and, more recently, with communities. Community-facing team science resources are scarce but present among some CTSAs, suggesting that capacity gaps might be remedied through cross-hub collaboration. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: We reviewed online information provided by the 62 current CTSAs to identify: (1) which hubs engage in community research, and (2) what resources the hubs utilize to orient, train, and support community stakeholders as research partners. We then examined the capacities of the collectively available CTSA resources to address needed knowledge, skills, and attitudes that community-engaged researchers have identified as essential for community-based stakeholders to partner equally in research. Finally, we explored practical challenges in team-based dynamics (e.g., interpersonal difficulties, expertise gaps, resource management) that may facilitate or hinder communities' research endeavors, and suggest resources that CTSAs might implement to facilitate team science dynamics. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Hubs (n=59) have community engagement programs, 12 of which provide community-based participatory research toolkits. Toolkits vary from basic checklists to fully developed modules. Some hubs also offer consultation services and partner match-making. Learning objectives include: outcome definition, logic models, and goal-setting. Learning resources remain underdeveloped to help communities appreciate the benefits of research engagement and convince academic partners of the value of real-world knowledge and community improvement relative to scientific advancement. Also lacking is easily accessible support to understand the research process, build verifiable trust, maintain bidirectional knowledge and assets, and implement consistent, best practice methodological and reporting protocols. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: Gaps between current hub offerings and community needs suggest prioritizing creation of resources whose learning objectives highlight the benefits of research engagement for community partners; foster mutual values affirmation between partners; and offer tools that build warranted community-researcher rapport.

Translational Science, Policy, & Health Outcomes Science

46733

Strategy for Effective Team Formation: A Case Study of Rutgers' Big Ideas Initiative

Ziyad Razeq, Biju Parekkadan, Nancy Reichman and Edmund Lattime
Rutgers University

ABSTRACT IMPACT: This study will provide valuable insight regarding the effectiveness of a top-down approach for team formation. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Rutgers' Big Ideas is a philanthropic initiative designed to gather team science ideas and present them to donors. We intend to evaluate this Team Science intervention and determine its feasibility in catalyzing the inception of team formation. We will explore the composition of teams that are formed using this particular method and team outcomes. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Our group will first evaluate the themes that were covered by the initial 210 submissions as well as the 40 ideas chosen to be presented at the Big Ideas Symposium. We will also be taking a look at the donor population that these ideas were presented to. Then, we will evaluate the 8-12 winning teams that were chosen to move forward. We will compare various success metrics of the 8-12 teams that were chosen compared to the 40 ideas that had not been chosen. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Encouraging team science through an initiative such as the Big Ideas forum is not only feasible, but also highly effective in creating resilient teams that show prolonged productivity in fundraising, publications, and other academic metrics. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS: Team Science is an exciting movement with immense potential. To that extent, this study seeks to discuss ways that academic leadership can inspire and foster effective team science collaboration. Concurrently, our case review lays the groundwork for further improvements to Team Science initiatives.

66361

TL1 Team Approach to Predicting Response to Spinal Cord Stimulation for Chronic Low Back Pain*

Kyle See[1],*Rachel Ho[2], Stephen Coombes[2] and Ruogu Fang[1]
[1]University of Florida Biomedical Engineering; [2]University of Florida Applied Physiology and Kinesiology

ABSTRACT IMPACT: Understanding how spinal cord stimulation works and who it works best for will improve clinical trial efficacy and prevent unnecessary surgeries. OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Spinal cord stimulation (SCS) is an intervention for chronic low back pain where standard interventions fail to provide relief. However, estimates suggest only 58% of patients achieve at least 50% reduction in their pain. There is no non-invasive method for predicting relief provided by SCS. We hypothesize neural activity in the brain can fill

https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2021.683 Published online by Cambridge University Press