Reducing Barriers to Equitable Access to Transformative Field Education Microgrants Lizzy Trower (Geological Sciences) behalf of the GEOL BAJEDI Committee

## 1. Project Abstract

Field-based courses in the geosciences and other natural sciences fields can provide invaluable and transformational experiences for studentsough extra course fees are not charged for these courses, the hidden costs of acquiriengecessary personal equipment for fieldwork can often represent a significant financial barrier and source of intequistry dents As one prong of an effort to eliminate this barrier, we (Trower and the GEOL BAJEDI Committee) have been developing a microgrant program to enable stuetneotised in GEOL field courses to purchase necessative equipment for personal use including hiking boots, waterproof jackets, backpacks, etd-lere, we request funding that we hable us to support the program we work to build a sustainable doing term funding model

## 2. Project Summary

Field courses form an integrahd require part of the curriculum in the Department of Geological Sciences (GEOL): these courses offer capstone experiences in which students can practice realworld applications of concepts introduced in previous cour the sough these courses, and other field experiences (e.g., experiences related to research) can be, at their best, transformative and invaluable pathways for learning, growth, team building, and empowerment (P. J. Stokes et al., 2015 hey can also be a significant source of inequality set al., 2020) Three of the most significant sources of inequity in both access to and experience in field courses are: (1) the highinancial costs associated with personal field equip medessary to create a safe and comfortable learning environme(a) the lack of accessibility of some field sites, particularly for students with disabilities; and (3) the potential neafern unwelcoming onditions at some off-campus field locations, the impact of which is meignificant for BIPOC and LGBTQ students (Giles et al., 2020; John & Khan, 2018) he project proposed here focuses were coming the first challenge, but we acknowledge that the second and third issues are also deeply important and require distinct solutions (Anadu et al., 2020; Demery & Pipkin, 2021; A. Stokes et al., 2019)

Unlike many other programs at peer institutions, the Department of Geological Sciences at CU Boulder does not charge course fees for its field courses; the **rfietilar** ourse fee for in state students at USased institutions in 2017 was \$3,850elleher, 2017) However, all field courses (including those in GEOL at CU Boulder) include hidden costs in the form of: (1) the cost of personal field gear, (2) the potential costs of lost wages, and (3) the potential costs of childcare (Abeyta et al., 2021) The latter two types of hidden costs are somewhat minimized for CU Boulder students due to GEOL's alternative field curriculum structure, which requires students to take one introductory field course and two advanced field modul the ision contrast with the -6-week long intensive summer field course that many performant that the typical undergraduate, while some CU Boulder students enter the program with little to no outdoor equipment or experience. Conversations with students in GEOL field courses have emphasized to us the significe of these financial barries. Students who struggle

with these hidden costs insistently request more support and information to know what they need (and how to afford it) rather than requesting that field course requirements be dropped.

Abeyta et al. (2021)estimated that the median investment in typical personal field equipment needed for a geoscience field course was \$478 in 2021 (25th percentile: \$262, 75th percentile: \$759, 95th percentile: \$1,528). This analysis included personal equipment including boots, rain gear, backpack, field notebook, writing implements, water bottle, sunscreen, etc., but did not include camping equipment that is sometimes needed (i.e., tent, sleeping bag, sleeping pad) since those items can more easily be borrowed and reflectively ever, we note that buying, rather than renting or borrowing, camping equipment can add significant cost. Abeyta et al.a(2621) noted that, due to the "pink tax" effect, comparable women's equipment costs more than men's equipment (typical added cost of \$61 to \$182 in their analysis) and plus sized women's clothing increased the cost even more (typical added cost of \$25 to \$63 in their analysis).

Starting in AY 2022/2023, we have been piloting a micro-

Beyond AY23/24, we intend to achieve a more sustainablet temng funding model by: (1) encouraging GEOL faculty to consider writing mignant support into NSF grants that fund field-based research; (2) working with the GEOLurani Advisory Board to solicit donations to specifically support this program; and (3) building connections and collaborations with other departments to seek external grant funding to support equitable participation in field courses and other field experiences across a breaksuite of disciplines.

The hidden financial costs of personal field equipment for field coarses particulary significant barrier tostudents from underivileged backgrounds, a group that commonly intersects with students with underrepresented identities. This project will enable students from all backgrounds obtainequitable opportunities to succeed and benefit from