

AGeS-DiG 2022 review context statement

Overview

AGeS-DiG aims to expand access to geochronology for those underrepresented in the Earth sciences. Through AGeS-DiG, we seek creative geochronology projects or initiatives designed to engage, train, and educate students at all levels (including undergraduate and community college) who have not traditionally had equal access to opportunities to be trained in geochronology methods.

For more including an overview of the proposal and review process please see this link: https://www.geosociety.org/GSA/Education_Careers/Grants_Scholarships/geochronology/GSA/grants/ages2/dig-overview.aspx

2022 review activity

Sixteen complete proposals were submitted to AGeS-DiG. This year's review committee consisted of 4 reviewers, with AGeS PI Flowers and CoPI Arrowsmith providing oversight.

2022 is a gap year in funding for the regular AGeS program. We have used our limited remaining funds to test the AGeS-DiG program. 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. Several proposals submitted by graduate student PIs to support their own research in AGeS labs were considered more suitable for the AGeS-Grad program than the AGeS-DiG opportunity.

We are grateful to all of the proponents for their interest in the program and regret that our limited funds only permit us to support two proposals, with two in reserve. We hope to acquire funds through a pending NSF proposal to enable us to support more DiG proposals in future years.

The committee members met three times in March and April 2022 having reviewed all of the proposals according to the review criteria: https://www.geosociety.org/GSA/Education_Careers/Grants_Scholarships/geochronology/GSA/grants/ages2/dig-review.aspx (available in advance to the proponents). All proposals were reviewed by all committee members in advance of the first committee meeting. In the first two meetings, each proposal was discussed in terms of strengths and weaknesses. Each proposal was ranked into one of three tiers using the numerical score from the rubric as an initial guide and then adjusted during committee discussion. The lead reviewer for each proposal prepared a review summary draft. In the third meeting, the review committee discussed the top tier of four proposals and identified those two with the highest priority for support. The other two are held in reserve in case of additional support, and all of the others declined. All of the unconflicted

committee members and the PI and CoPI reviewed all of the proposal review summaries, and the group discussed refinements for any future AGeS-DiG opportunities.

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, if participating in the review meeting, leaving the virtual meeting room before discussion began about that proposal.