Question 7: Alternatively, should basic requirements be tailored to each of the subdivisions of the Department?

1) yes.

2) no

3) I think this is what we have already, which is why there are so many courses that serve so few people.

4) No, from core classes, I think everyone should follow their own interests and needs.

5) also, yes; these should be incorporated into the graduate curriculum.

6) To some extent, eg if paleo is your major you should know invert, vert, paleobot, micro stuff not just your own special group of study. But I think orals takes care of it.

7) I think this option sound better than the previous option.
Although each student should have a general knowledge base in the earth sciences, the needs of students in different subdivisions can be very different.

8) Making it easier for a student to take a few good courses outside of their specialty would be better.

9) Yes. e.g. Introduction to Seismology for seismology students.

10) Blank.

11) Yes.

12) No

13) seeing this question, I retract the above answer. I think required courses should be determined at the subdivision level.

14) No - only if in addition to department-wide requirements

15) See previous question.

16) This is definitely what I think. Like I sort of said above, I think all students should have at least a basic understanding of the major earth science disciplines that aren't covered by their major. With

today's trend seeming toward interdisciplinary work, this would seem to be a good idea to me. I think it's obvious that students within a subdivision will receive lots of education in that subdivisions, but might not be exposed to others, without basic requirements being imposed.

17) This is how it is now.

18) Although individual subdivisions should have their own curricula, all students should be required to take these basic courses. In addition to providing a solid introduction to the range of research at Lamont (and GISS and AMNH), this would also increase the social cohesion of the incoming class of students.

19) No. Why have an EES department then? Presumably the students, along with their advisor, can be trusted to fine tune their course selection.

20) THEY SHOULD BE TAILORED TO THE MAJORS AND MINORS.

21) Yes. And have the courses sequenced and scheduled appropriately. I think this would help immensely. Once the 'basics' are taken care of, in a systematic and efficient way, students should quickly move on to advance courses in more narrow disciplines.

22) I think I answered this in the preceeding answer, but the answer here is yes, of course.

23) No answer.

24) YES

25) Blank

26) Given the small size of our department and that there are likely to be only a few students in each subdivision, basic requirements should be tailored and based both on one's current research interests and background. For example, for someone with no geology background, it makes sense to require at least one course on the geosphere, hydrosphere, and atmosphere. Obviously this would not be the case for someone who was an undergrad geology major.

27) That is not inconsistent with the above. Could have a dept. wide requirement, then requirements within subdivisions. But this would be a lot of courses. We're supposed to be researchers.

28) Isn't that going to lead back into the 'too many classes, not enough students' problem?

29) Yes, but there should be a consensus among departments about basic requirements in other fields. For instance, if the people in charge of oceanography were to come up with a basic requirements list, knowing them, I doubt I would find their list adequate to give a broad but strong background in earth science in general.

30) Yes.

31) No. I don't think having 3 or even 2 courses that all students take would cause students not to be able to take courses in their area of expertise. Tailoring requirements to each subdivision would cheat us of an opportunity to learn more than just our expertise. More likely than not, we will have very few opportunities to do this in the future. We are getting a Ph.D. in earth and environmental sciences, not in petrology or paleoclimate or whatever.

32) Maybe should have a few courses that everybody is required to take (see last questions) and in addition some classes that are required in each subdivision of the department.

33) I don't think that there should be a strict core curriculum in each subdivision. For one at the graduate level the students should know what it is that they need to take and do not need to locked into a set of classes that are not all necessary. Additionally by the time you finished DEES core classes, subdivision core classes and the classes you really need to know it would take you 10 years to finish a Ph.D.

34) I think that some requirements for each division or group can be wrapped around the outline above with additional room for electives, if necessary, during a student's 3rd yr.

35) No, it's nice to think it'd be possible to switch disciplines.

36) If that is the case, then there should be different departments within DEES with different PhDs and masters awarded accordingly.

37) THIS IS DANGEROUS. THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT REASON I CAME TO LAMONT WAS BECAUSE THE DIVISIONS ARE LOOSELY DEFINED AND FLEXIBLE. PEOPLE FLOAT BETWEEN DIVISIONS AND DEFY CLASSIFICATION. THAT IS THE BIGGEST BEAUTY OF

LAMONT. I DO NOT THINK SUBDIVISION REQUIREMENTS ARE A GOOD IDEA. WE DON'T EVEN HAVE WELL DEFINED "SUBDIVISIONS".

38) No answer

39) No answer

40) I don't think there is a need for this.

41) Maybe so. My program has basic requirements, though they do not include specific courses necessarily.

42) No answer

43) Yes, absolutely. Set of required courses based on major.

44) No answer

45) No answer

46) No answer

47) YES, SEE ABOVE

48) No answer

49) Yes. Perhaps better, but there can be broader subdisciplines than, say, physical oceanography and atmospheric science. this is where maybe the climate studies idea comes in. per the above response, it may not make sense for students in e.g. petrology or seismology to take some of the same courses as students interested in climate change.

50) No answer

51) See previous question

52) No answer

53) No answer

54) Perhaps not “requirements” per se, but definitely a better defined list of expectations for students in each subdivision/major/minor, and a list of which courses cover those topics. The “suggested preparation” pages for minors in geophysics, physics, and seismology are quite detailed, while the same descriptions for minors in (for instance) geomorphology and petrology list 2

classes and 5 and 3 suggested readings (respectively)—that's it. Many minors, as far as I can tell, have no suggestions at all. Specifics are really helpful for students trying to study for orals.