





Background



Encouragment




Application Process


Comments:

- Process is generally valuable, but...
- Without funding, unclear whether it's worth spending less time on departmental work
- Response is slow, meaning important decisions need to be postponed---for example, summer courses and travel
- Application process badly timed
- Requirements for the plan are too specific
- More feedback during the process of writing (before submission)


How challenging did you find the process of developing a broad plan at the start of the program to be?




How useful do you feel it was to be pushed to develop a broad plan at the start of the program to be?




Attendance



Importance




Projected Involvement




Projected Coursework



If you did not have your current status/funding in the IGERT program, how many courses not required for your degree would you expect to take?




Have IGERT expectations limited your ability to take the courses that you need for your individual interdisciplinary training?



Research Rotation



Continuation Models



Certificate Program model

- Pro: line on a CV
- Pro: worth it for formalized mentorship from faculty from other disciplines, not for the certificate itself
- Pro: enforce homogeneity of involvement across disciplines better than IGERT does
- Pro: formal coursework
- Neutral: unclear difference from LSCF model
- Con: don't link everything to course credit
- Con: unclear difference from NACS (for linguists)
- Con: not useful in the job market

Language Science Center Fellows model

- Pro: more like IGERT currently
- Pro: isn't centered around coursework
 - Important parts of IGERT are the non-coursework parts
- Pro: "flexibility"
- Con: unclear expectations in absence of formal requirements