of clinical research via Clinical and Translational Science Awards core curriculum, mentorship, and an online seminar series. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: MCHS funded 4 key introductory research courses: 1) Manuscript Writing, 2) Grant Writing, 3) Basic Biostatistics, and 4) Essentials of Clinical and Translations Science Program. In addition to course offerings, a Research Interest Group was formed to guide novice rural researchers on topic selection and study design. This cultivated interest to create a 16-month clinical research webinar series offering CME credits. Subsequently, an internal MCHS RFA was launched seeking early-stage investigator pilot proposals focused on rural health. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: In 2023, over 140 MCHS providers enrolled in 324 CCaTS research courses. This training led to the submission of 53 proposals to the inaugural MCHS 2023 RFA, of which 15 were awarded. Additionally, 14 MCHS extramural grants were submitted in 2023. Training efforts expanded in 2024 to include an online research seminar series covering various study topics and providing CME credit, with an approximate attendance up to 196 attendees per session. The second annual MCHS RFA resulted in 4 internal awards, with an additional 22 extramural grant submissions. These collective efforts have increased the number of MCHS first and last author publications and the number of MCHS providers with academic rank. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Leadership's commitment of resources to educate, mentor, and engage clinicians was crucial to our success and demonstrated a strong return on investment. To maximize impact in community-based practice, continued commitment is needed in the form of protected research time, funding, and research administration support of projects of interest

172

Collaborations between translational science programs and academic health sciences libraries

Bart Ragon[1], Sandra Burks[2], Jill Deaver[3], Emily Glenn[4], Kristi Holmes[5], Megan von Isenburg[6] and Elizabeth C. Whipple[7]
[1]University of Virginia, integrated Translational Health Research Institute of Virginia; [2]University of Virginia Chair, Clinical, Academic, and Research Engagement; [3]University of Alabama at Birmingham Libraries, Lister Hill Library of the Health Sciences; [4]University of Alabama at Birmingham, McGoogan Health Sciences Library; [5]University of Nebraska Medical Center, Great Plains DIrector, Galter Health Sciences Library and Learning Center; Director of Informatics and Data Science, Northwestern; [6]University Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute (NUCATS) and [7]Northwestern University Duke University Medical Center Library. Associate Director of Informationist Services, Welch Medical Library; Indiana Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Collaborations between translational science programs and academic health sciences libraries can enhance research impact by improving efficiency, leveraging diverse professional expertise, and expanding opportunities for collaboration between librarians and translational science programs. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: A team science approach was utilized, integrating findings from a literature review, practical experiences of health sciences librarians, and collaborative writing. An analysis of case studies from institutions with successful partnerships explored the roles of libraries in partnering with translational science programs. The data collected were mapped to the Clinical and Translational Science Award Program's five functional areas outlined in the Notice of Funding Opportunity PAR-24–272. Librarians from 21 institutions engaged in discussions and collaborative writing to share insights and identify key factors driving successful partnerships. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Academic health sciences libraries play a crucial role in enhancing translational science programs through expert knowledge management, facilitation of research dissemination, and support for interdisciplinary collaboration. Results from this project include a table outlining 16 specific opportunities mapped across five functional areas and six topical categories for translational science programs and libraries to collaborate effectively.Successful partnerships demonstrate improved research workflows, increased interactions between researchers and libraries, and accelerated translation of discoveries into clinical settings. These collaborations illustrate opportunities for other institutions to adopt as they consider best practices in supporting translational science. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: By combining resources and expertise between libraries and translational science programs, these partnerships enhance the ability to transform scientific discoveries into real-world clinical applications, drive innovation, and amplify the contributions of both libraries and translational science programs.

174

Career Mentorship in Clinical Research Pathways in Medicine: UCLA Mentorship and Advocacy in Teaching Clinical Health-Related Research (MATCH) Program

Brisa Garcia, Diana Ambrosio, Gloria Moon, David Rincon, Sabrina Ghalambor, Madeline Mai and Laurie Shaker-Irwin
University of California, Los Angeles

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: To assess the impact of the MATCH Program on mentees and mentors over the years, we have surveyed both groups on the effectiveness of the mentorship process, how the MATCH program influenced mentees' future career plans, and their ongoing interest in clinical research. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: To evaluate impact on mentees and mentors in the most recent cycle, we fielded two program evaluation surveys, for mentors and mentees. The surveys were distributed and collected using Qualtrics in May 2024. The mentee survey collected data on relationship with mentors, quality of mentorship, future career/education plans, and self-assessment of the program impact. The mentor survey collected data on relationship with mentees, mentees' engagement, and a self-assessment of the program impact. Qualitative analysis was conducted to determine key themes expressed by participants. The responses were compared to assess the effectiveness of the mentoring relationship from both parties. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Respondents included 15/20 (75%) mentees and 15/20 (75%) mentors. All mentees (100%) and mentors (100%) stated they would like to continue their relationship outside of the program. The majority of mentees 13/15 (87%) and mentors

https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2024.829 Published online by Cambridge University Press