

## AGeS<sup>3</sup> - Advancing Geochronology Science, Spaces, and Systems

<https://agesgeochronology.org/>

### 2023 AGeS-DiG (Diversity in Geochronology) Application Review Context Statement

#### Overview

AGeS-DiG aims to generate and test innovative ideas to expand geochronology access for those minoritized in the Earth sciences. Through AGeS-DiG, we seek creative geochronology projects or initiatives designed to engage, train, and educate students at any level (including undergraduate and community college) who have not historically had equal access to geochronology data and training.

#### 2023 Review Activity

Twelve complete proposals were submitted to the AGeS-DiG funding opportunity. The AGeS<sup>3</sup> Program was able to fund 9 proposals at an average cost of \$16,886 this year. The committee was unanimous in its support of the rankings and awards.

This year's review committee consisted of 6 reviewers, with AGeS CoPI Arrowsmith and PI Flowers providing oversight. Priority was given to projects with the most authentic research experiences for the student participants, in particular to those supporting student cohorts that would broaden participation as demonstrated through well explained and effective recruitment and mentoring activity. Projects with the most feasible timelines and the most clearly defined plans for project implementation were also considered more competitive.

The committee members met virtually three times in October and November 2023. All proposals were reviewed by all committee members according to the review criteria (see below), which were available in advance to the proponents. As an initial guide, each proposal was scored by all unconflicted reviewers in advance of its discussion. The proposal was then discussed in terms of strengths and weaknesses, with all reviewers contributing comments. The lead reviewer for each proposal prepared a review summary draft. The PI and CoPI reviewed all of the proposal review summaries, and all unconflicted committee members were able to provide input on the summaries. The committee also discussed refinements for the next AGeS-DiG opportunity, which will be held in fall 2025.

#### Conflicts of Interest

Conflicts of interest are taken seriously by AGeS. We identified conflicts of interest between the review committee and the proposal personnel as well as with the collaborating laboratories at the start of the review process. The committee members as well as Flowers and Arrowsmith recused themselves where conflicts were identified. That meant not providing comments or review, and leaving the virtual meeting room before discussion began about that proposal.

## **Review Criteria**

Proposals were evaluated based on their **(100 points total)**:

### **1. Potential to successfully recruit and select the target student group (35 points)**

Extent to which the project: i) clearly identifies and justifies the minoritized group(s) to be targeted; and ii) provides new opportunities for a cohort of these students to engage in geochronology. This includes an effective recruitment and selection plan for the student participants.

### **2. Potential to successfully mentor and train the student cohort (35 points)**

General likelihood that the project will successfully mentor, retain, and train a cohort of students in geochronology methods and in the science behind the proposed project. This includes the strength of the project's proposed support plan for the students, including interaction with the mentor/PI, professional development, and demonstration of the safe and welcoming environment for the activities. Priority will be given to projects that emphasize authentic research experiences for the student cohort.

### **3. Science motivations (15 points)**

How compelling is the science motivation and how well is it aligned with NSF Earth Sciences priorities (<https://www.nap.edu/catalog/25761/a-vision-for-nsf-earth-sciences-2020-2030-earth-in>)? This may include geoscience education motivation questions. How appropriate is/are the geochronology method(s) for the research questions?

### **4. Coordination, timeline, and budget (15 points)**

Evaluation of the proposed timeline and budget, specifically considering the time required for project implementation and completion. This criterion relies partially on good coordination between the proponent and any partners, evaluated based on the proposal and any support letters.