OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The objective of this study was to identify the support needs of faculty conducting health-related community engaged research (CEnR) at the University of Michigan (U-M). Our primary goal was to develop a faculty-informed needs assessment survey. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: We conducted semi-structured interviews with seven U-M faculty members engaged in health-related CEnR. Participants were affiliated with the Michigan Institute for Clinical and Health Research (MICHR), represented a variety of health disciplines, and had varying levels of CEnR experience. Interviews explored research processes, challenges, and support needs. Transcripts were thematically analyzed. Findings informed the design of a university-wide needs assessment survey, to be distributed to ~1,000 faculty conducting health-focused CEnR across all three of U-M's campuses. This formative qualitative study represents the initial phase of a broader, mixed-methods effort to strengthen institutional support for translational research through community engagement. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Interviews revealed key needs across the CEnR lifecycle from study design, partnership development, project management, and dissemination. Themes included the value of introductions to communities by trusted faculty, challenges sustaining partnerships between funding cycles, and the need for greater recognition of CEnR in promotion and tenure. These insights directly shaped the needs assessment survey, which aims to validate and expand on these themes. Findings from the survey will inform CE Team priorities, guide service development, and address barriers that limit the effectiveness and impact of community-engaged translational research at U-M. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: By centering faculty voices, this work ensures future programming and services are aligned with real-world needs. Strengthening institutional support for CEnR will improve the systems, methods, and process that enhances its effectiveness and impact, accelerating research translation and fostering stronger university-community partnerships.

269

Community Forums as participatory dissemination: A collaboration between an academic institution and community partners

Celeste Charchalac-Zapeta[1], Grace Cua[2], Devyani Gore[2], Sandra Morales[3], Crystal Stevenson[4], Jerisha Mack[5], Evonne Fluornoy[5] and Kathryn Welch[6]
[1]University of Illinois Chicago; [2]University of Illinois Chicago, Center for Clinical and Translational Science; [3]University of Illinois Chicago, Center for Clinical and Translational Science; [4] University of Illinois Chicago, Auburn Gresham Neighborhood Center; [5]University of Illinois Chicago, Office of Community Engagement and Neighborhood Health Partnerships and [6]Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The University of Illinois Chicago's (UIC) Center for Clinical and Translational Science (CCTS) aimed to increase research dissemination findings to strengthen community relationships and opportunities for researchers to be in dialogue with communities. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: From 2024 to present, the CCTS developed a collaboration with community and internal UIC partners connected to Auburn Gresham (AG), a predominantly African American community located in a far southside neighborhood of Chicago, to co-design a series of Community Forums. Community partners included UIC's Neighborhood Center AG site, dedicated to supporting local stakeholders through strategic interventions, Office of Community Engagement and Neighborhood Health Partnerships (OCEAN-HP), fostering community partnerships through service, education, and research, and the Greater Auburn Gresham Development Corporation (GAGDC), a grassroots organization focused on community development in low-income communities. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Each community forum discussed research topics affecting the AG community by providing a safe space to foster bidirectional dialogue among community members, university researchers, and other field experts, while simultaneously bridging the gap between the community and research. Topics were identified through AG members' community expertise and audience anecdotal/survey feedback. The forums were free and evolved to provide community resource packets and basic health screenings (e.g., blood pressure and glucose). This was an iterative engagement process (e.g., establishing relationships and trust, incorporating community feedback) to best mold the community forums to AG's needs. The community audience and researchers/field experts have continued to express their interest in future community events. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: The AG community forums have increased the interest in what research is and how to be involved among community members. Researchers/field experts have reiterated the importance of bidirectional dialogue with the community and the positive impact on research. These forums support research dissemination and community engagement.

270

Evaluation of a community studio program to integrate lived experience across translational research

Anne Trolard[1], Justin Xu[2], Hilary Broughton[2], Kym Radford[2], Robert Doyle[2], Angela Brown[3] and Brett Maricque[4]
[1]Washington University in St Louis; [2]Washington University in St Louis School of Medicine, Institute of Clinical and Translational Sciences; [3]Washington University in St Louis School of Medicine, Division of Cardiology and [4]Washington University in St Louis School of Medicine, McDonnell Genome Institute

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Community engagement is required to translate scientific discovery into improvements in health. Lived experience is essential knowledge for translational research activities. Community studios facilitate interaction between researchers and community members, but mechanisms of how lived experience integrates into research are under explored. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: The community studio program at the Center for Community Health Partnership and Research was evaluated through interviews with participating community health consultants (CHCs) and researchers. Fifteen facilitated community studios held since 2023 were included. Study participation was organized by studio: invitations went to all researchers, and then to three CHCs randomly selected from each researcher's studio. Rapid qualitative analysis methods were used to create analysis templates based on key questions from the interview guide. Interview notes were summarized according to the template and compiled into matrices for study team reflection and discussion. Responses to key questions were articulated during group discussions and iteratively refined. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Thirteen researchers and 25 CHCs were

https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2026.10469 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interviewed from April to June 2025. Eighty-six percent of researchers had a research degree, either a PhD or Master's; 85% were associate or full professors. None reported formal training in community engaged research. Several types of knowledge gaps were filled including correction of faulty assumptions, awareness of the impacts of SDOH, and ideas for solving operational challenges. CHCs were 80% female. CHCs felt valued during the studio experience, received benefit from hearing the lived experiences of others, and gained new perspectives on their health issue. CHCs expressed a desire to know the impact their participation had on the research, and several said they would have to see it to believe it. Both researchers and CHCs appreciated the expert facilitator. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: Everyone learned during studios. Eliciting lived experience filled different knowledge gaps. Sharing provided social benefits and studios functioned like a third space, a merging between the built and social environment. An expert facilitator played key roles that included fostering belonging and translation of lived experience into knowledge.

272

*Team science and community engagement: CTSI cross collaboration for community engagement and action

Karen Hinshaw[1], Nicole Tarr[2] and Jessia Schrodel[2]
[1]Indiana University - Indiana CTSI and [2]Penn State

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Cross-institutional collaboration describes the development of cross-institutional partnership between two CTSI's to overcome common challenges faced by both entities. Community engagement work discusses ways that Strategic Doing fostered sustainable initiatives to improve wellness in rural communities. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Through collaborative efforts, the Indiana and Penn State University Clinical & Translational Science Institutes were able to plan and implement community engagement initiatives to advance health outcomes among under-resourced populations in each of their respective communities. The institutions shared and utilized key principles of an educational series entitled "Strategic Doing (SD)" that provided instruction on developing and facilitating complex collaborations. Leveraging SD practices, both CTSI's community engagement teams guided groups of local community leaders and stakeholders in meaningful, action-oriented partnerships to promote better health and wellness. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: At Indiana CTSI, six staff completed Strategic Doing Institute Agile Leadership training. As a result, community partners in 11 counties implemented evidence-based strategies, including a community garden with cooking classes, a mobile kitchen for nutrition education, and wellness passports at community events with food samples, screenings, and educational programs. At Penn State, twelve staff (9 CTSI, 3 community partners) completed the same training. Of 8 post training evaluation respondents, 75% were extremely likely and 25% somewhat likely to apply the training to their work. Trainees are leading task forces that received CTSI funding focused on substance use, healthy aging, and public health infrastructure and health literacy. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: SD trainees have reported transformative changes when facilitating community-academic partnerships. By using a scientifically based framework, task forces have experienced enhanced synergy, resulting in increased engagement and accountability that led to improved wellness in the community.

273

*Translating Wealth-Health Frameworks into clinical and community practice: A community participatory approach

Tiffany Younger
Yale School of Medicine

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: This study aimed to develop and validate the Black Wealth-Health Framework, a community-derived model that integrates behavioral, cultural, and structural dimensions to explain and intervene on the relationship between wealth and health among Black individuals. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: Using a community participatory approach, we conducted semi-structured interviews and focus groups with 40 Black adults across diverse life contexts. Grounded theory and thematic analysis guided data collection and synthesis. Participants explored how they define and experience wealth and health across physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual domains; identified culturally grounded strategies for maintaining well-being; and described interactions with structural systems such as housing, employment, and healthcare. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Preliminary findings reveal that Black adults conceptualize wealth and health as multidimensional, intergenerational, and deeply relational. Themes include the centrality of cultural wealth such as mutual aid, spirituality, and community care, the burden of structural barriers, and the embodied stress of economic exclusion. These insights informed a conceptual and visual model linking systemic inequity, cultural resilience, and health outcomes. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: The Black Wealth-Health Framework bridges public health, economic justice, and cultural resilience to guide clinical, community, and policy interventions that reflect the lived experiences of Black people. Translating this framework into practice offers a pathway toward wealth-health equity.

274

Early review for pilot project engagement plans and aims: Supporting integration of lived experience across translational research processes

Hilary Broughton[1], Angela Brown[2] and Brett Maricque[2]
[1]Washington University in St. Louis and [2]Washington University in St. Louis, Institute of Clinical and Translational Sciences

https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2026.10469 Published online by Cambridge University Press