

to 18 years old. Research trajectories will be developed by assessing chronological research by outcome groups (physical, mental and behavioral, interventions, and biomarkers), study population categories, as well as exposure location and mechanism. Demographic data extracted will be used to assess whether there are disparities in the research conducted to date for this population and if so, in what areas. Research recommendations and clinical implication extracted from references will be used to assess whether more recent research has addressed research from the early post 9/11 years. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** WTC research strengthens our understanding of 9/11 health effects and provides a way to improve healthcare for the people afflicted from 9/11 exposures. The anticipated results from this scoping review can lead us to identify past research challenges and current knowledge gaps that the Program can address in future research grants.

141

### Translational Barriers, Facilitators, and Benefits of Impactful Research on Health Inequities in the Criminal Justice System

Boris B. Volkov<sup>1,2</sup>, Chris Pulley<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca Schlafer<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Minnesota Clinical and Translational Science Institute, Minneapolis, MN <sup>2</sup>Institute for Health Informatics, and Division of Epidemiology and Community Health, Minneapolis, MN <sup>3</sup>Department of Pediatrics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** - Illuminate processes and findings of a translational science case study of impactful research with incarcerated pregnant women and mothers; - Improve our understanding of the translational mechanisms by sharing translational challenges, facilitators, and **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** Utilized the following evaluation methods and tools: - The Retrospective Translational Science Case Study protocol to examine translational path from innovation to policy and 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 over 50 interviews with 30 stakeholders featured in published sources. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** The research contributed to community and public health, policy/legislative, clinical/medical, and economic benefits, social/institutional change, health equity advocacy, catalyzing research (consequent research studies) and public awareness. Translational research challenges: cultural differences between research and prison system; politics of translating research to policy change; issues of capacity, power, privilege, and opportunity when doing community-engaged research; and science vs. social justice criticism. Facilitators of translation: CTSA support; stakeholder engagement; authentic collaboration; researchers as translation catalysts; and engagement in legislative activities. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** The evaluation case study provides useful knowledge about translational impact, challenges, and facilitators of community-based research that moved along the translational continuum and contributed to transformational, systemic changes on the legal, clinical, organizational, and interpersonal levels.

142

### Using evaluation methods to improve evaluation processes: Creation and implementation of a new continuous improvement process at Duke Univ. Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI)

Jessica Sperling, Stella Quenstedt, Joe McClernon  
Duke University

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** (1) Assess challenges with our current continuous improvement processes via stakeholders. (2) Implement a revised continuous improvement process. (3) Evaluate the revised processes to assess implementation and use for strategic improvement. (4) Implement analysis mechanisms for new process to assess trends across the CTSI. **METHODS/STUDY POPULATION:** We used a mixed-methods, multi-phased, stakeholder-engaged approach with different processes per objective. Obj. 1: We implemented focus groups, surveys, and listening sessions incorporating two populations: both teams required to participate in reporting process, and CTSI leadership. Obj. 2: We utilized data from Obj. 1 processes to develop a revised continuous improvement process. Obj. 3: We integrated qualitative feedback processes onto the structure of continuous improvement processes, and we implemented a survey to assess use and value for the new process. Obj. 4: We developed a qualitative coding schema to assess key trends across teams and over time. **RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS:** Obj. 1: Numerous challenges in metrics format and process, including significant limitations in data use to inform decision-making and appropriately assess impact. Obj. 2: Resultant changes to continuous improvement processes, including a restructured reporting format and use-oriented approach that enhanced organizational integration; changes included added focus on facilitators of success, challenge, and key opportunities to better inform decision-making. Obj. 3: The majority of teams experienced the new quarterly process as a better tool for program monitoring and communicating program needs to leadership, but that fuller integration into vertical communication is needed. Obj. 4: Implementation of new analysis process enabling examination of trends and themes across diverse teams within the CTSI. **DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE:** This work has particular relevance within ACTS given our focus on a clinical and translational research enterprise, the complexity in evaluating the diverse work of translation research entities, and limitations in a commonly-used metrics-monitoring approach. Our focus on improving translational processes advances translational science.

143

### Wouldn't you like to know what your research study participants are thinking? A collaboration for Empowering the Participant Voice

Rhonda G. Kost<sup>1</sup>, Joseph Andrews<sup>2</sup>, Raneer Chatterjee<sup>3</sup>, Alex Cheng<sup>4</sup>, Ann Dozier<sup>5</sup>, Daniel Ford<sup>6</sup>, Paul A. Harris<sup>4,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Rockefeller University <sup>2</sup>Wake Forest University Health Sciences <sup>3</sup>Duke University <sup>4</sup>Vanderbilt University <sup>5</sup>University of Rochester <sup>6</sup>Johns Hopkins University <sup>7</sup>EPV Steering Committee

**OBJECTIVES/GOALS:** Empowering the Participant Voice (EPV) is a Rockefeller-led 6-CTSA consortium that aims to collect research participant feedback through new Research Participant Perception Survey (RPPS)/REDCap infrastructure and data aggregation to a national database. Here we describe diverse Use Cases and launch