

indicating support of research transparency and reproducibility. As a point of comparison, a second set of terms were drawn from key attributes of “gold standard science” described in Executive Order 14303. Frequency distributions were used to quantify the usage of specific vocabulary across cooperative (U), career development (K), and training (T) grant types, and over time (2006 to 2024). RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: As a less-structured metadata field, project abstracts have posed challenges for data cleaning and analysis. The abstracts retrieved through the API occasionally contain irregular formatting and unexpected insertions. Preliminary findings show that CTSA hub awards most frequently and consistently described “interdisciplinary,” “multidisciplinary,” “collaboration,” or “collaborative” approaches. Over time, abstracts increasingly emphasized “reproducible” science or “reproducibility.” Among abstracts for cooperative agreements (UL1 and UM1), mentions of “data sharing” and “data commons” infrastructure peaked in parallel with the COVID-19 pandemic. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: The strategy employed in this project demonstrates how existing commitments made through CTSA may align with the framework proposed for “gold standard science”.

221

Mapping translational science priorities across rural CTSA

Alyson Eggleston¹, Rebecca Butcher², Nasser Sharareh³, Beth Tigges⁴, Megan Dickson⁵, Hilary Surratt⁵, Jillian Harvey⁶, Shani Worrell⁷, Jessica Presley⁷, Rebecca deLacerda Allen⁵, Maran Subramain⁸, Maggie Padek Kalman⁹, Catherine Denial², Trent Matheson³ and Kelsey Stoltzfus¹

¹The Pennsylvania State University; ²Dartmouth College;

³University of Utah School of Medicine; ⁴University of New Mexico Clinical and Translational Science Center; ⁵University of Kentucky Center for Clinical and Translational Science; ⁶Medical University of South Carolina; ⁷University of Arkansas Translational Research Institute; ⁸University Of Iowa Institute for Clinical and Translational Science and ⁹University of Kansas Frontiers

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: Building on Schneider et al., which mapped translational science (TS) principles across urban CTSA hubs, evaluators and one pilots administrator within the Consortium of Rural States CTSA examined how hubs prioritize these principles. This work can ensure shared TS values and inform a common rubric across rural CTSA institutions. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: We analyzed CORES ranking data from eight CTSA hubs ($n = 49$ respondents). Item-level mean ranks and standard deviations summarized TS principle priorities, while respondent-averaged means reduced bias from unequal item counts. Site-level profiles were compared using Spearman rank correlations to

examine cross-hub similarity. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Our analysis of CORES data (8 hubs, $n = 49$) replicates Schneider et al.’s finding that TS solutions center on generalizable solutions and efficiency/speed. Rural hub rankings showed tight agreement and low dispersion, confirming these as shared core TS values. Despite differing experimental and hub contexts, the pattern mirrors Schneider et al. (2024) and strengthens support that NCATS’ TS principles apply consistently across both urban and rural CTSA hubs. DISCUSSION/SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT: CORES hubs prioritized Translational Science (TS) projects emphasizing generalizable solutions and efficiency, reflecting shared values. Findings align with prior TS/TR work and support creating a concise, qualitative TS rubric to guide co-funded projects with system-level impact.

223

Strengthening dissemination and implementation capacity at UW–Madison: A landscape survey to inform and support the translational science workforce

Felice Resnik, Shellie Ellis, Cathy Kelly, Molly Murphy and Anne Gravel Sullivan

University of Wisconsin – Madison

OBJECTIVES/GOALS: The Dissemination and Implementation (D&I) Launchpad at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (UW) supports a growing community of implementation scientists with the goal of strengthening the field. We conducted a survey to identify those doing the work, assess experiences, priorities, and needs to strengthen D&I at UW. METHODS/STUDY POPULATION: In September 2025, the UW ICTR D&I Launchpad administered a landscape survey via REDCap to UW individuals who had signed up for the D&I listserv, attended a D&I event, or received a D&I grant. The survey was also promoted at events for broader participation. The survey assessed D&I identity, skills, training experiences and needs, barriers, support preferences, and network. Of 851 invited and 13 requests, 229 responded (26.5% response rate). Respondents were 53% faculty, 39% staff, and 8% students/postdocs from over 10 UW schools, colleges, and partners. RESULTS/ANTICIPATED RESULTS: Most respondents (67%) identified as contributing to D&I science; 33% said “No” or “Not sure,” citing lack of training, awareness, or other identity. Skill levels varied: 41% beginner, 39% intermediate, 12% advanced, and 4% expert. Top support needs for D&I research were funding, training, grant advice, and consultations. 47% reported receiving D&I training, most frequently through UW programs, coursework, and national programs. Requested training topics included