

Amy Eremionkhale

Teaching Statement

My teaching experience began four years ago as a teaching assistant (TA) for *Introduction to Finance*, a second year required course for all business students at Lehigh University. I provided support to the professor by teaching four weekly recitation sections of thirty students, grading exams, and holding office hours. The professor of this course requested that I be his TA every semester following my first performance and evaluation, which resulted in me serving as his TA for five semesters. In an effort to diversify my experience, I requested and was granted the opportunity to be a teaching assistant for *Principles of Economics* and *Money, Banking, and Financial Markets*, two of the most popular courses at Lehigh. In my role as a TA for these courses, I taught four weekly recitation sections, held office hours, and graded the students' homework and exams. All three of these courses expanded my ability to work with both small and large groups of students. My work as a TA was recognized by my students, some of whom nominated me for the college-wide TA of the Year award, an award for which I received honorable mention. A summary of my teaching assistant evaluations is presented at the end of this teaching statement.

In the summer of my third year I became an independent instructor for *Principles of Economics*, an introductory course on microeconomics and macroeconomics. In the summer of my fourth year and first semester of my fifth year, I became the independent instructor for *Applied Microeconomic Analysis*, an intermediate microeconomics course with an emphasis in calculus application. As an independent instructor, I was responsible for developing the entire course, syllabus, exams, quizzes and homework. A summary of my instructor evaluations is presented at the end of this statement. It shows the notable improvement I made as an independent instructor advancing from a moderate first experience to an exemplary second. I was delighted when a student said “(Prof. Amy)...was definitely effective in helping me to comprehend the course material” about me in my evaluation.

It is my goal to give my students the ability to relate to the material I present them in such a way that they can describe in their own words the concept discussed in each class. The key to achieving this goal, I found, is concentrated preparation on my part as the instructor. Over the course of my teaching experience, I grew to appreciate the need to incorporate various teaching techniques during a lecture in order to reach as many students as possible in the time I have their attention. My approach to addressing the challenge of student learning heterogeneity is to present information in a manner that supports all four broad types of learners, following the visual, auditory, reading/writing, and kinesthetic (VARK) model (Prithishkumar & Michael 2014).

I can teach courses in Intermediate Econometrics, Statistical and Quantitative Methods, Principles of Economics, Intermediate Microeconomics, Intermediate Macroeconomics, Money, Banking and Financial Markets, and Health Economics at the undergraduate level. I can also teach business school courses including Introduction to Finance, and Microfinance.

Citation

Prithishkumar, Ij, and Sa Michael. “Understanding Your Student: Using the VARK Model.” *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine*, vol. 60, no. 2, 2014, p. 183, doi:10.4103/0022-3859.132337.

Selected Teaching Assistant Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Question	Introduction to Finance					Principles of Economics	Money, Banking and Financial Markets
	Fall 2014 (70% Response Rate)	Spring 2015 (49% Response Rate)	Fall 2015 (65.12% Response Rate)	Spring 2016 (50.34% Response Rate)	Fall 2016 (74.36% Response Rate)	Fall 2017 (37.31% Response Rate)	Spring 2018 (53.85% Response Rate)
The recitation instructor was well prepared	4.92 (N/A)	4.72 (N/A)	4.88 (4.73)	4.66 (4.52)	4.91 (4.86)	4.54 (4.49)	4.81 (4.73)
The recitation instructor was able to explain the material	4.87 (N/A)	4.67 (N/A)	4.82 (4.59)	4.60 (4.34)	4.81 (4.77)	4.48 (4.15)	4.79 (4.49)
The recitation added to the overall value of the course	4.91 (N/A)	4.64 (N/A)	4.86 (4.48)	4.58 (4.30)	4.81 (4.79)	4.54 (4.07)	4.79 (4.45)
The recitation instructor was an effective discussion leader	4.82 (N/A)	4.68 (N/A)	4.80 (4.38)	4.44 (4.07)	4.70 (4.66)	4.09 (3.90)	4.76 (4.33)

Notes. Questions are answered on a 5 point scale from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (5). Evaluation scores are averaged across sections. Mean department scores are reported in parenthesis. (N/A) -- The mean department score did not become available until the evaluation process switched from paper to digital in Fall 2015.

TA-Related Comments:

"Amy is the reason I understand Finance!"

"Amy was so helpful in learning material"

"The best TA ever hands down. I have never had someone teach material as effective as Amy did."

"Amy was a very good TA and I was very lucky to end up having her for Eco 1 because without recitations, a lot of the class material would have probably still been very confusing for me. What I liked was that she went beyond just the normal TA roles and sometimes would teach material if students were confused and it was needed."

"Amy was such a great help in this course. She is probably the reason I did as well as I did. She clearly went over everything we learned in class and went more into depth than we did in lecture. Everything was clearly explained and the objectives of each day were always on the board when we walked in which I found super helpful and it also shows that she was prepared with the information well before hand. "

"In all honesty I learned and understood the concepts exponentially better in her recitation compared to the actual class. I will be taking her Eco 146 class in the fall because how great of a teacher she is."

Selected Instructor Evaluation Summaries		
Evaluation Question	Applied Microeconomics Analysis	Principles of Economics
	Summer 2018 (81.25% Response Rate)	Summer 2017 (53.63% Response Rate)
Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective.	5.00 (4.53)	3.80 (4.32)
The instructor presented the material clearly	5.00 (4.49)	4.00 (4.31)
The instructor stated clearly what was expected of the students	4.92 (4.71)	3.80 (4.52)
The instructor knew the subject well	4.85 (4.78)	4.00 (4.69)
The instructor was generally well prepared for the class	4.92 (4.76)	4.20 (4.60)
The instructor treated students with respect	5.00 (4.88)	4.70 (4.76)
Interaction between students and instructor was positive	4.92 (4.81)	4.50 (4.68)

Notes. Questions are answered on a 5 point scale from disagree strongly (1) to agree strongly (5). Evaluation scores are averaged across sections. Mean department scores are reported in parenthesis.

Instructor-Related Comments:

"Professor Amy was amazing."

"I really enjoyed being in this class with Professor Amy. She was very good at laying out what needed to be taught and how it could be applied to our work in an organized way. By teaching the theory, showing how it can be applied, and then making us do the problems on our own, I was able to learn the material."

"Course expectations were clear and concise and the teacher did a great job of relating confusing and sometimes distant information to her students. Was definitely effective in helping me to comprehend the course material."

"Professor E was really helpful when students were confused. Gave out helpful handouts and assessments matched the material we had studied."

"Fantastic course. I learned a lot and felt comfortable with the information throughout the course."

"Amy is an excellent teacher, clearly states what needs to be done and is always available for help for the students. She is very fair and clearly knows the subject matter. More professors need to be like Amy!"