183

Qualitative evaluation of a coaching program for early-stage researchers in KL2 and T32 training programs

Lauren Van Scoy[1], Erika Van Dyke[2], Marie Boltz[2], Dale Fallon[3], Jessica Petrie[2] and David Rabago[2]
[1]Penn State University, Penn State Clinical and Translational Science Institute; [2]Penn State University and [3]The Communication Gym

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: To evaluate the impact and perceived value of a structured coaching and leadership program for trainees in KL2 and T32 programs. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: This qualitative evaluation included individualized coaching and group workshops incorporating leadership development and the DISC behavioral communication model (Dominance, Influence, Steadiness, and Conscientiousness). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with twelve KL2 and T32 trainees between July and August 2025. Transcripts were analyzed using descriptive content analysis and inductive coding by two analysts in MAXQDA RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Five key themes emerged: 1) both T and K trainees consistently described coaching as a broadly positive and beneficial experience; 2) coaching helped trainees build concrete organizational strategies, particularly around time management and logistical processes; 3) the curriculum helped build trainees' confidence and professional identity, especially around communication with mentors, bosses, or their team; 4) coaching was perceived as complementary and well integrated within KL2 and T32 training, particularly by addressing "soft skills" missing elsewhere; and 5) participants recommended stronger orientation, more opportunities for practical skill-building during sessions, and offering greater diversity and choice in coaches. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Individualized coaching complements training for early career translational researchers. Trainees gained practical tools for team management and strategic planning, while benefiting from a confidential space for professional growth. Findings suggest coaching is valuable to training programs for developing translational research leaders.

184

Developing quantitative writing evaluations for TL1 scientific writing programs

Jen Merems[1], David Puthoff[2], Leigh A. Mrotek[1], Xudong Wang[1], Vivek Prabhakaran[1] and Bernadette T. Gillick[1]
[1]University of Wisconsin Madison and [2]Marshfield Clinic Research Institute

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Scientific writing is vital for TL1 trainees, yet evaluating writing programs effectiveness is challenging. Current evaluations gauge writing confidence, not skill competency. Our study aimed to develop a quantitative writing evaluation tool to assess technique and improvement longitudinally across the TL1 program. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The writing evaluation tool uses 19 typical grammar concepts embedded within three paragraphs. TL1 trainees received a list of these concepts without definitions and were instructed not to research them. They were asked to identify each concept, its location, and explain the reasoning behind of their choice (e.g., Qualifier: "very" and "significant" are redundant, thus "very" can be removed). Points were awarded when concepts were identified (0.5 point) and reasoned appropriately (0.5 point). The participants included 12 predoctoral and 3 postdoctoral trainees. Evaluations were administered at the start of Fall 2025 and again in Spring 2026. A paired *t*-test was used to assess longitudinal growth, with significance determined at $p \geq 0.05$. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: We separated our participants into two groups by experience level: 1Y) 8 trainees (1-year predoctoral) and 2Y) 4 (2-year predoctoral) and 3 (1-year postdoctoral) trainees. After the Fall 2025 evaluation, the highest score was 9.5, with the lowest score being 0.5. On average, group 1Y scored 3.8 and group 2Y scored 3.1, indicating that although the trainees were separated by experience level, their writing abilities did not differ ($p = 0.57$). We anticipate that the Spring 2026 evaluation will show positive longitudinal growth for both groups as they learn to identify grammar concepts. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Developing an effective quantitative writing evaluation tool allows facilitators to refine writing programs for trainees. This study is the first step in testing the tool's impact. Results will guide improvements in the evaluation tool and support ongoing evaluations of writing program effectiveness within TL1 training.

185

Exploring the career trajectories of DrPH graduates with environmental and occupational health focused dissertations: A descriptive analysis

Olumide Olorunnishola[1], Anita Hawkins[2] and Sharon Barrett[2]
[1]Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland and [2]Morgan State University

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Despite the growing importance of environmental and occupational health (EOH) in public health, little is known about how DrPH graduates with EOH-focus perceive training adequacy, navigate careers, and leadership roles. This study explores the alignment between dissertation, career, and leadership outcomes among EOH-focused DrPH graduates. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: This cross-sectional study analyzed 60 DrPH dissertations completed between 2000 and 2024 with EOH foci from U.S-based public health schools and programs. Secondary data were drawn from dissertations in ProQuest dissertation database, institutional records, Council of Education on Public Health (CEPH) records, and LinkedIn profiles. Variables examined include program characteristics, dissertation design, dissertation-career alignment, post-DrPH leadership role, and perceived preparedness for career and leadership roles. Data were summarized by descriptive statistics. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Majority (57%) of graduates were female; 81.7% trained at CEPH-accredited programs. Prior bachelor's degrees were mostly in biology (20%) and master's in public health (33.3%). Dissertation themes

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 03:54:35, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2026.10392