

on the teaching fellow experience

[music department, harvard university]

a project conducted by Kiri Miller (G-5)

with the support of the Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning

and the participation of music department graduate students

spring 2005

This project was undertaken with the aim of assessing, improving, and stimulating discussion on the TF experience in the music department. This pamphlet is intended for students, faculty, and interested staff. It could serve many purposes—for example, to encourage pre-generals students to think about teaching issues in advance; to suggest shifts in perspective for current TFs; to generate topics for discussion between course heads and TFs; or to give undergraduates insights into the experience of their teachers.

contents

i. survey results

- comfort index statistics
- some interpretations of the data
- anecdotal responses

ii. issues raised in a follow-up discussion

- time management
- grading & evaluation
- TF relationships with course heads
- teaching departmental vs. CORE courses

iii. points for further discussion

appendix: survey forms

i. survey results

Two surveys were distributed to all in-residence music department graduate students—one version for experienced TFs, one for those who had not yet taught at Harvard. The surveys appear in their original form at the end of this document.

total responses 17
 exp 10 = experienced Harvard TF
 new 7 = no Harvard TF experience

Two “new” respondents had prior classroom teaching experience;
 two others had taught private lessons or done tutoring.

total TF experience (at Harvard, in music and CORE courses)

38.5 semesters
 85 sections

Harvard courses taught, with number of respondents per course

- 1 Music 1 (Western music history for non-concentrators)
- 3 Music 2 (theory/composition for non-concentrators)
- 1 Music 3 (composition/20th-century techniques)
- 2 Music 51 (1st-year theory/keyboard skills for concentrators)
- 6 Music 97 (Western music history for concentrators)
- 1 Music 154 (2nd-year theory for concentrators)
- 1 Music 155 (modal counterpoint)
- 1 Music 156 (tonal counterpoint)
- 2 Music 180 (chamber music performance)
- 1 Bach (CORE)
- 2 Chamber Music (CORE)
- 6 First Nights (CORE)
- 1 Soundscapes (CORE)
- 1 Swing (CORE)
- 1 Symphonic Century (CORE)

comfort index statistics

[Answers in each category were provided on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being *unprepared/anxious* and 4 being *very comfortable/confident*.]

Experienced TFs: In hindsight, how comfortable were you with your first teaching assignment in terms of

most frequent average range of responses

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----|-----|
| knowledge of material | 3 | 2.9 | 2-4 |
| time management | 2 | 2.9 | 2-4 |
| classroom teaching skills | 3 | 2.7 | 2-4 |
| grading/evaluation skills | 3 | 2.8 | 1-4 |
| interaction with students | 4 | 3.6 | 3-4 |

Future TFs: If you are assigned to teach your ideal course (_____), how comfortable do you expect to feel in terms of

| | <i>most frequent</i> | <i>average</i> | <i>range of responses</i> |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| knowledge of material | 3 | 3.3 | 3-4 |
| time management | 2 | 2.3 | 2-4 |
| classroom teaching skills | 3 | 2.3 | 2-4 |
| grading/evaluation skills | 2 | 2.6 | 2-4 |
| interaction with students | 3 | 3 | 2-4 |

range of cumulative scores (across all five categories) reported by individuals

exp 10-18 out of 20
 new 11-19 out of 20

average cumulative comfort index

exp 14.9 out of 20
 new 14.6 out of 20

some interpretations of the data

[Caveat: this is obviously a small, self-selecting sample. For this reason I did not attempt to track results against gender, age, or nationality, interesting though the results might have been. We can't draw statistically significant results from this data, but we can discuss hypothetical interpretations and be inspired to investigate some specific issues that emerge.]

The hindsight group expressed **less confidence in knowledge of course material** but **more confidence in interaction with students** than the anticipation group. "Interaction with students" received such high comfort ratings among experienced TFs that it seems likely that an overall positive experience has colored their recollection of their earliest teaching assignment. This assessment category was the only category with 4 as the most frequent response.

Time management emerged as a key concern for both groups, but of somewhat greater concern in the anticipation group than in the hindsight group.

Confidence does not necessarily correlate with ability. The TF who gave the lowest confidence self-assessment in hindsight (10 out of 20) won CUE teaching awards in both semesters of the first year of teaching.

Confidence does not necessarily correlate with experience. These results were all over the map. Only 3/10 of the experienced TFs reported a 4 in as many as three categories, whereas 2/7 of the future TFs reported a 4 in four categories. Also, consider the following correlation of experience levels with the highest and lowest reported comfort indices:

total comfort index (out of 20)

- 19 future TF, taught one course before coming to Harvard
- 18.5 future TF, no classroom teaching experience (some private lessons)
- ...
- 11 future TF, taught three courses at two institutions before coming to Harvard
- 10 experienced, award-winning TF

While questions of sample size and individual personality are obviously important here, the statistical and anecdotal survey results suggest to me that even if new TFs have prior teaching experience, **they often have anxieties specific to Harvard's teaching format and the perceived nature of Harvard undergraduates.**

anecdotal responses

[Responses have been shuffled question-by-question to preserve the anonymity of respondents. Context from an individual's previous responses is provided in brackets when necessary.]

Experienced TFs

Before you began teaching, what did you expect to be

- a. most challenging about the experience?
- b. most valuable/rewarding?

[a. most challenging]

Being coherent in front of a class.

Talking about 18th-century music.

Keeping sections structured, being able to answer all questions about music with which I'm not too familiar.

Discerning what information was most important for the students, and allotting classroom time accordingly.

Being able to answer all the students' questions.

Preparing difficult and sometimes unfamiliar material; fielding tough questions from Harvard undergrads.

Intimidated by the smarty students.

Balancing time between teaching-related duties and my own work.

Seeming prepared week to week (remains a problem; being prepared, is different than seeming).

Though I felt confident in the material I'd be teaching, many aspects of the course were unfamiliar. Grading theory assignments was quite new to me when I began the course. Also, I had previously only taught non-music majors, so I wasn't sure how I'd adapt to working with more advanced students.

[b. most valuable/rewarding]

Encouraging independent research; conveying enthusiasm for the field.

Interaction with students (especially non-majors) with a wide array of interests.

Outgrowing feeling intimidated [by "the smarty students"].

The chance to introduce students with virtually no background to Western classical music of one sort or another; in the case of 97, an opportunity to go into real depth with advanced students .

Learning about music with young (read: energetic and guileless) companions

Making people better critical thinkers.

Helping students develop critical thinking skills; developing one-on-one relationships with students.

Honestly, just surviving a year of teaching at Harvard.

I hoped dealing with relatively advanced material and serious music students would be useful in developing my teaching skills for the future. I also expected that this would be a good chance to brush up on my own tonal harmony skills, and to get a sense of how to grade composition-based assignments.

To share
my strengths with students (who might benefit).

Were these expectations accurate? Were there unanticipated challenges/rewards? (If so, please list some.)

Goodness yes! Four years later, my students' projects still amaze me. Set the bar high and they fly over it! A few problems with slackers in Music 1a, which was discouraging, along with foreign grad students in the class who wanted to be told the answers to things (and were otherwise great students).

I quickly got used to grading assignments, though I often found I was spending more time on grading than I would have liked. The students in the class were a pleasure to work with, and I found that my ability to lead a group discussion improved over time. Planning for and teaching sections made me feel confident in my ability to teach a course of this type in the future.

Unanticipated rewards: 97 was great: got two close friendships, wrote letters of recommendation, it benefited me greatly. Unanticipated challenges: CORE bureaucracy; being hanged out to dry; being insulted and harangued in front of students by a professor and treated as a failure by dept, horrible.

Accurate with respect to [introducing students to Western classical music], not ["fielding tough questions"] and only occasionally [challenged in terms of preparing difficult material].
Unanticipated: Difficulty of keeping on top of grading in CORE courses. Particularly with 97, the chance to become truly close with the students in my section, serve as a mentor.

It was indeed rather difficult to intuit the course heads' expectations for my section content, but since this obliged me to go forth and decide for myself and my students what we'd best do, I suppose a good side-effect was my becoming much more assertive.

Unexpected challenge: Grades/grading create(s) distance between teacher and student that is pedagogically counterproductive.

Challenges: students' emotional issues.

Time management has remained the largest challenge—especially evaluation of student writing in courses with larger enrollments (i.e., anything except Music 97).

Neither course [both CORE] has provided much room for working on critical thinking or having discussions about something other than the technical aspects of music. Rewards: with some students in particular, being able to help them individually on writing or other more “general” skills.

I started with Music 3 which was a good fit for me. It wasn't intimidating at all. Challenge was (still is) in teaching a survey of 20th-century music.

Briefly describe your relationship with the faculty course head(s) (e.g., by listing a few adjectives).

cordial, professional

[class 1]: fabulous, respectful.[class 2]: fine.

[class 3]: OK. [class 4]: belligerent, abusive, debasing.

Widely ranging dependent upon the individual—anything from extremely collegial, supported, and invested to distant/remote.

As stated above, there was murkiness, and some power stuff I could never quite grasp. Other adjectives ought to include disengaged and sporadic: disengaged because of unclear and seemingly random instructions, sporadic because regular, productive meetings were a bit low-priority. Although the time I taught for someone who liked to meet long and often, we ran out of things to say and it was awkward. Maybe that relationship issue could be easier to contend with if one has a sense for what other TFs are getting/demanding? Like we'll do when we meet!

[class 1]: detached and independent (in a good sense), encouraged by.

[class 2]: independent, engaged, friendly, consulted.

(but I specifically chose courses with those goals in mind, so I was happy to get 'em)

Not very close—okay, serious ideological and pedagogical differences.

Generally collegial, transparent, opportunity for give and take. Occasionally difficult, but only with regard to one course.

Occasionally interfered with my lesson plan. Mostly very helpful and appropriately demanding.

Generally straightforward, open, professional, yet friendly.

I found the course head easy to work with: open-minded and supportive of my decisions about how to organize my sections and what material to discuss.

What are your best hopes for the potential goals/benefits of the lecture/section format

a. for your students?

b. for yourself ?

- a. Feel comfortable asking “dumb” questions; learn to love more kinds of music.
 - b. Able to pace material well, lots of individual attention when necessary.
-
- a. After four very different semesters, I’ve decided that sections are for expressing and sharing ideas.
 - b. My goal for myself is to let the idea-sharing happen, which work always seemed to have the benefits of rousing students to activity and happiness.
-
- a. Allows students to discuss stuff.
 - b. Eases my way into teaching.
-
- a. To learn enough about “music terms” and how to use them without sacrificing opportunities for more lasting and socially important discoveries.
 - b. To have enough leeway in the type and (perhaps even more importantly) amount of material to cover that I can develop useful teaching skills.
-
- a. 97r—I don’t think lectures were particularly useful for students. Btter: 3 sections/wk with prof visits for some—too disconnected. I don’t think lecture/section splits work for small courses; better to have some discussions with Prof and some lectures by TF, depending on expertise and not always discussion in section and lecture in “lecture.” Would be different in a huge core, but I avoided them.
 - b. At the time, I didn’t think there were benefits to the split. Now I realize how much I gained some lecture material without too much of a time suck.
-
- a. The opportunity to balance and become comfortable with two modes of learning (structured vs. less-structured, formal vs. informal, etc.)
 - b. Opportunity to watch faculty at work in lectures and to develop skills in interacting with students in section.
-
- a. I think that the sections are best for the students when they really take advantage of the smaller class size (for my course, sections were quite small: 5 or 6 students). These are the things I thought worked well in the lecture/section format: 1) sections require more active participation and thought from the students; 2) students present on their own work, and get experience talking about their ideas; 3) students get to see and discuss the work of their peers (and get feedback on their own work); 4) there’s a chance to ask questions about lecture material.

- b. For Music 154, I teach two different types of sections. Some are “workshops,” in which students present on their work and we discuss it as a group; some are more like lectures, in which I lead a discussion (usually an analysis) about a piece of music. I learned a lot from the different challenges of these two types of teaching. I also think that the small class size gave me a good sense of how the students were reacting to the course material: which skills and topics made sense to them, and which needed to be explained more carefully.

- a./b. I don’t have any hopes. Bear in mind that the days of TF freedom are over. 97 no longer seems as a course to be the de facto course-organizing opportunity it was [when the respondent taught it]. I feel that the lecture-section format is a lost cause.

- a. Personalized learning experience, interaction with peers.
- b. Intimate teaching environment in section; opportunity to observe lectures by experienced professors.

further comments and suggestions from one respondent:

What I wish I was encouraged to do more often was to immediately take notes on what happened in section, to make up my own alternative syllabi along with the class, on what I would like to do in my own classes, etc., to keep better records of what worked and what didn’t. I’m trying to prepare three classes right now, and I’m afraid I have just this vague good feeling about certain things and an “ugh, well, at least I survived” about others, and I know at the time I had specific ideas about what worked and what went wrong, but I don’t have good memories about what they were.

Musicologists: No matter what your specialty is, prepare your 19th-century classes well. Most job interviews will take place in February till March or early April. Most of them will ask you to teach a course of their music survey. Their survey courses will probably be somewhere between Beethoven and Debussy. So, if you aren’t ready to prepare a course on Schumann’s D-minor symphony with two days’ notice (it happened to me, and one of those days was on a plane), you’re not going to do well on the market. Others have confirmed that these are the periods you’re constantly asked to teach for interviews.

A Q to send to alumni: How well prepared did you feel after your first semester of teaching on your own? What did the experience of TFing leave unsolved? I think we (as a department; grad students and faculty) need to ask alumni about their experiences.

Ask for a recommendation from faculty members immediately after teaching for them.

Future TFs

As you think about teaching here, what do you expect to be

a. most challenging about the experience?

b. most valuable/rewarding?

[a. most challenging]

Coming to understand American undergrads and what they expect (and need).

Teaching unfamiliar subjects to very bright and critical undergrads who may expect more from me than I can deliver.

Assessing the appropriate level of expectations I should have of my students.

I think interacting with students, and really making sure that they understand the material, and presenting it in an interesting way, is both the most challenging and most rewarding aspect of teaching.

Fair and balanced grading. Managing all material in allotted time.

Finding the right balance of challenge and manageability. Pitching the sections to the appropriate level.

Teaching in English. The workload.

[b. most valuable/rewarding]

Very interesting experience, hopefully students who are interested in the subject, working together with great profs.

The exchanges in class and organizing information into teachable format.

Having had a really disparate background in theory basics, and spending all my time thinking about fragmentation and difference, I think it will be good for me to be in a role where I have to be coherent and consistent (and where at least some of that comes from the professor).

Affirming what I know; recognizing what I don't know and fixing it.

Expanding and consolidating my own knowledge through sharing it with others.

Gaining insight into music and reception and its place in culture from the students; learning unfamiliar subjects.

Briefly describe how you feel about your future teaching (e.g., excited, uncertain, stage-fright, ready to be in charge).

I feel all of these things. I am worried, though, about being able to balance teaching with my own research needs.

All of these except stage-fright. I think it will be less work and less stressful than coursework because it's only one topic at a time.

Ready to be in charge. Excited.

I think the two years of coursework has helped me think a lot about different teaching styles. I am looking forward to teaching, but quite anxious about it.

Excited but worried about pitching material at appropriate level to abilities of students.

Uncertain—I wonder how similar Harvard undergrads will be to undergrads back home—but not anxious.

I look forward to teaching in the future. Not only is it a chance to reflect on what one has already learned, but it is also a chance to do give something back to the academic community in a tangible way.

If you visited a section this spring, what did you learn from the experience? Any major surprises or insights?

I was impressed with how well-behaved the students were!

No major surprises. It made clear how much you have to prepare for the section and how well you should know what you teach.

The main thing I noticed was just how much the students seemed happy to provide the substance of the class; [the TF's] function seemed more like a referee and timekeeper. With such engaged students, less can be more.

What are your best hopes for the potential goals/benefits of the lecture/section format

a. for your students?

b. for yourself ?

- a. To make misunderstanding and dissent maximally productive.
- b. I'm ambivalent about the way we write literate musicianship over students' already productive intuitions; I hope to texture my ambivalence.

- a./b. Not really sure how to answer—generally my colleagues who have worked the lecture/section format have found it a fairly straightforward way to get into teaching, review their own thinking on a subject, etc.
- a. I hope that interacting with someone who is still young and enthusiastic (me?!) will inspire them to continue music studies.
- b. Harvard students are smart. I'm sure they will teach me lots!
- a. That they will become as passionate about music as I am.
- b. That I will learn a lot (you learn 90% of what you teach...)
- a. Critical thinking evoked from small-group conversations. Review unclear subjects.
- b. Learn to lead discussions better. Insight into adolescent thinking. Learn the material. Learn subject from students.
- a. That they will learn things about music that will serve to enrich their lives beyond Harvard.
- b. That I will learn how to teach to a new audience successfully.

ii. issues raised in a follow-up discussion

[On May 18, 2005, twelve graduate students attended a follow-up meeting to discuss the survey results. This meeting was moderated by Christina Linklater (G-5), with notes taken by Kiri Miller. Roughly equal numbers of experienced and future TFs were present.]

time management

The moderator observed that university guidelines suggest that TFs should spend about 10 hours per fifth on their teaching work. (Typically one section = one fifth; graduate students normally teach two or three fifths at a time.) This fact did not seem to be widely known.

TFs reported spending up to 40 hours a week on work for two sections, especially in the first several weeks of the semester. They expressed dissatisfaction at the proportion of this time that was spent on grading. One TF observed that he spent less time on grading/comments over the course of the term as he realized that students were not responding to the comments or improving along the lines he had suggested. At the start of the term he might spend 45 minutes commenting on a 5-page paper, whereas he might only spend 10 minutes at the end of the term. Others noted that when a CORE course shifted to a format requiring many short papers over the course of the term, TFs had to spend a higher proportion of time commenting on the papers and had less time and flexibility to devise interesting assignments or innovative section work. It appeared that the actual time spent on teaching was less of a concern for most people than the morale problems derived from spending a lot of time on grading without getting a positive response from the students. The discussion persistently drifted to:

grading & evaluation

TFs expressed disappointment that their students seem intensely grade-oriented and that course staff meetings often revolve around grading rather than discussions of pedagogy or the course material itself. Because many faculty members rarely do much grading at Harvard, they may not convey detailed expectations to their students; meanwhile, students often have detailed anxieties with respect to every point on an exam. Faculty sometimes design assignments or exams without considering the nuts and bolts of evaluation (e.g., how to establish a standard across the course; point breakdowns; how to minimize grading time and maximize response).

It was noted that grading standards vary from course to course: for example, there can be pressure to achieve something like a curve in a CORE course, whereas higher grades are the norm in concentration courses. TFs face conflicting pressures from students who are accustomed to high marks and faculty who don't want their courses to look too easy. TFs in general and international TFs in particular might benefit from reading the Bok Center's publications on the Harvard grading system—although several people observed that if they really followed these guidelines they would encounter constant challenges from students and overrides from course heads.

We face a subject-specific challenge in that we must avoid penalizing students who have little technical experience with music (notation, performance terminology, etc.). A music theorist noted that the Bok Center guidelines cannot provide much help for evaluating music theory assignments; hashing out a grading system with the course head becomes crucial in such courses.

Practical tips:

In the case of low-stakes assignments (e.g. weekly assignments that add up to a small percentage of the course grade), it may be helpful to use a check/check-plus/check-minus system rather than assigning number or letter grades. Students are less likely to contest a “check” than a B. One TF who used this system reported telling his students that he would also reserve a check-plus-plus for extraordinary work; his students rose to this challenge.

Providing typed rather than handwritten comments on papers and large projects can be worth the trouble. Students are impressed by the formality of the response; TFs can sometimes cut-and-paste certain comments to address the same issues in multiple papers; and TFs have a record of their comments, making it easier to track student progress across the term.

A TF observed that it is crucial for the course head to be willing to play the “bad cop,” especially when it comes to contested grades. Students will often drop a complaint when faced with the authority of the course head; their resentment will dissipate rather than settling on their TF, with whom they have more personal interaction.

The Bok Center occasionally offers workshops on effective, efficient paper-grading; there are also regular orientation sessions on Harvard's grading system and general evaluation issues. A large course might consider inviting a Bok Center representative to one or more staff meetings to provide assistance. Several TFs noted the success of this approach in “First Nights,” which has a Bok Center representative present at all staff meetings.

TF relationships with course heads

While most survey respondents gave a generally positive report of their interaction with course heads, virtually no respondents used language that would imply they viewed course heads as mentors or models for their own teaching. When this point was raised for discussion, the drift of conversation suggested that TFs often view their section teaching as independent from and occasionally in conflict with the content and pedagogical style of lecture. TFs discussed how to deal with ethical dilemmas, such as situations where one's own knowledge or scholarly orientation directly contradicts material presented by course textbooks or lectures. One TF noted that students may try to gain their section leader's support in criticizing or undermining the course head; he advocated looking for ways to accentuate the positive aspects of problematic material—e.g., asking students what they *could* get out of a book or lecture—in order to keep the lecture/section relationship productive. Others suggested encouraging students to be articulate and engaged in their criticisms rather than dismissive. TFs can effectively model this behavior for their students.

Participants were concerned that there are no clear channels for presenting a complaint when a TF has a serious conflict with a course head; there are also no established grounds for dismissing a TF from a course. It was suggested that TFs who made a complaint to the chair risked being branded as “difficult.” Past cases in which TFs had felt unsupported by or alienated from the department were discussed.

teaching departmental vs. CORE courses

TFs noted several differences between the teaching experience in the CORE and in departmental courses, all of which might inform one's choices in signing up for teaching:

Students

“know how to behave” in CORE classes; they are well-acquainted with the format. They may require more active guidance in departmental courses.

Departmental courses generally have fewer TFs. This can mean a closer relationship with course heads, but also creates a greater risk of personal tensions in staff meetings. It is also possible for two or three TFs decide to teach their sections the same way and use the same supplemental materials, leaving a TF with a different lesson plan as an “outlier” whose students are perplexed as to the nature of their section.

There is greater demand from course heads for a wide grade spread in CORE courses.

CORE courses usually have review-oriented sections; departmental courses may require more independent preparation time (but perhaps with greater intellectual satisfaction).

CORE students and courses tend to be more exam-focused than departmental students and courses. CORE students may be resentful if they perceive that their section does not provide as much direct exam preparation as another section.

Many resources are available to TFs in the CORE, including special publications, Head TF training, and (often) collections of past section assignments. On the other hand, CORE TFs must negotiate additional bureaucratic requirements (e.g., doing all course photocopying at the CORE office; adhering to stringent copyright requirements; dealing with reserves at Lamont).

iii. points for further discussion

How might faculty allow TFs greater flexibility in making assignments without compromising course integrity?

How might TFs learn to devise assignments that require less grading time and/or that require a higher level of student response to feedback? (Perhaps a workshop or a web-based compendium of successful assignments would help?)

Could staff meetings include more discussion of pedagogical issues, perhaps with the help of outside moderators?

How could TFs get more from their relationships with course heads and experience a greater sense of connection between section and lecture? How might they convey investment in lecture materials to their students?

Could there be a forum for TFs to provide written feedback to course heads, like a CUE evaluation, without fear of reprisal for critical comments? (Perhaps only in CORE courses?)

Could TFs in all courses (not just Music 97) be given the opportunity to present a lecture, particularly if they have special expertise in the course material?

Might course heads guest-teach one meeting of each section or grade a random sampling of assignments, as some faculty in other departments have done?

Could TFs be directly involved in designing course-wide exams and assignments?

How could the department—or the university—establish formal channels for addressing conflicts between TFs and course heads, including appropriate grounds for dismissal from a course?

Music Department Teaching Survey—Experienced TFs

Your responses to this survey will help provide topics for a follow-up discussion in May and will be compiled into a booklet for future department TFs. Your name will not be used in the booklet. Submit responses to Kiri Miller by May 6th. Please write on this sheet or send an email to kmmiller@fas.harvard.edu (list responses by question number). Thank you!

1. How many semesters and sections (total) have you taught?
2. What music department courses have you taught?
3. Before you began teaching, what did you expect to be
 - a. most challenging about the experience?

b. most valuable/rewarding?

4. Were these expectations accurate? Were there unanticipated challenges/rewards? (If so, please list some.)

5. Briefly describe your relationship with the faculty course head(s) (e.g., by listing a few adjectives).

6. What are your best hopes for the potential goals/benefits of the lecture/section format
a. for your students?

b. for yourself ?

7. In hindsight, how comfortable were you with your first teaching assignment in terms of

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| a. knowledge of the material | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. time management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. classroom teaching skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. grading/evaluation skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. interaction with students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

unprepared/anxious.....very comfortable/confident

[Please use the back of this sheet for more room or to provide any additional ideas.]

Music Department Teaching Survey—Future TFs

Your responses to this survey will help provide topics for a follow-up discussion in May and will be compiled into a booklet for future department TFs. Your name will not be used in the booklet. Submit responses to Kiri Miller by May 6th. Please write on this sheet or send an email to kmmiller@fas.harvard.edu (list responses by question number). Thank you!

1. Did you teach before coming to Harvard? If so, what level/subject?

2. As you think about teaching here, what do you expect to be
a. most challenging about the experience?

b. most valuable/rewarding?

3. Briefly describe how you feel about your future teaching (e.g., excited, uncertain, stage-fright, ready to be in charge).

4. If you visited a section this spring, what did you learn from the experience? Any major surprises or insights?

5. What are your best hopes for the potential goals/benefits of the lecture/section format
a. for your students?

b. for yourself ?

6. If you are assigned to teach your ideal course (_____), how comfortable do you expect to feel in terms of

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| a. knowledge of the material | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. time management | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. classroom teaching skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. grading/evaluation skills | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. interaction with students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

unprepared/anxious.....very comfortable/confident

[Please use the back of this sheet for more room or to provide any additional ideas.]