defined, well-documented PM approaches reported lower levels of conflict, as well as higher levels of research productivity and team satisfaction. Further, PM systems depend on and influence teams' information and data management approaches, also key contributors to a team's ability to achieve their scientific objectives and conduct rigorous, reproducible research. We anticipate that results from UX testing of PM templates will demonstrate high levels of interest in implementing these tools to support collaborative research, providing an accessible entry point to proven PM strategies standard adapted from other fields. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Providing context-appropriate, flexible, and adaptable PM tools as well as training in PM best practices to science teams has the potential to streamline team communication and collaboration, improve efficient use of funding, and enhance research productivity. Studying such implementations will yield additional insights for Team Science.

484

Rethinking Team Science metrics through collaborative guideposts

Kristen McQuerry[1,2], Megan Hall[2], Caitline Phan[2], Yana Feygin[2] and Emily Slade[2]
[1]University of Kentucky College of Pharmacy and [2]University of Kentucky

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Interdisciplinary teams are central to modern science, but measuring their success remains difficult. Traditional metrics like publications or citations often miss key contributions, such as community engagement, mentorship, and lasting collaboration. New approaches are needed to capture these goals. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: We introduce a framework aligning success metrics with a team's organizing priorities, illustrated through two contrasting models: Team A, a time-bound, community-focused group emphasizing rapid deliverables and public health partnerships, and Team B, a mentorship-driven, development-focused group prioritizing capacity building and long-term growth. These teams share a commitment to advancing translational research but differ in how they pursue these goals. Team A emphasized centralized coordination, shared ownership of goals, yielding timely scholarly outputs, and setting the stage for future collaborations. Team B prioritizes long-term development, sustained collaboration, and the mentorship of early-career faculty, even if traditional academic productivity metrics accrue more gradually. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: These contrasting approaches raise an important question: how should success be defined and measured for teams with very different goals, structures, and outputs? From these cases, we derive four Collaborative Guideposts: Time Perspective, Unit of Assessment, Desired Outcomes, and Sustainability, which provide a systematic way to identify and select metrics that meaningfully capture a team's contributions and impact. By offering a structured yet adaptable framework, these guideposts enable teams to track progress, monitor outcomes, and ensure alignment with their unique goals, operating environments, and stages of development. This approach contributes to advancing validated models of team science by providing a practical method for tailoring evaluation criteria to diverse collaborative contexts. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: By grounding evaluation in team-specific goals, this framework supports more accurate assessments of collaborative impact. Guideposts provide a flexible structure to align metrics with context, guide discussions of outcomes, and evaluate teams on productivity, collaboration, mentorship, and long-term scientific progress.

485

Equipping leaders to foster psychological safety on interdisciplinary translational teams

Maria Hernandez, Molly Murphy, Shannon Casey, Michelle A. Chui, Elizabeth S. Burnside, Whitney A. Sweeny
University of Wisconsin

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Interdisciplinary collaboration drives innovation by uniting diverse knowledge and perspectives. Leaders play a crucial role in establishing psychological safety, upon which effective collaboration relies. This study developed a workshop to support leaders in fostering psychological safety on interdisciplinary translational teams. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Purposive sampling was used to recruit senior faculty members at a large Midwestern University from biomedical, clinical, and behavioral/social science fields. Eight senior faculty members were invited via email and all consented to participate (N=8). Our sample included associate professors (n=3) and professors (n=5), from pharmacy (n=5) and medicine and public health (n=3), with one jointly affiliated with Veterans Affairs. Semi-structured interviews were conducted via Zoom. Interviews explored the challenges and facilitators to creating psychologically safe environments. Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data. Coders utilized a combination of deductive and inductive coding to conceptualize, define, and name emergent themes. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Through our analysis we identified a framework that included three layers: leader mindset, leader behavior, and team culture. The leader mindset describes the mindset leaders hold to create psychologically safe environments, including values of openness to feedback and commitment to trust-building. Leader behavior describes the observable actions leaders adopt to translate their mindset into everyday practice, including empowering team members and modeling effective behavior. Finally, team culture describes the shared values, expectations, and mannerisms that enable team members to build and sustain psychologically safe teams. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: This study highlights how leaders approach building and sustaining psychologically safe teams. Findings can inform leadership development efforts and practical strategies for leaders to adopt. Optimizing psychological safety on interdisciplinary translational teams may promote innovation, team performance, and resilient team cultures.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 16 Nov 2026 at 06:04:00, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2026.10616