Teaching Statement
Min Kim

% www.min-kim.net

✉ minkim1@sas.upenn.edu

Throughout my doctoral training at the University of Pennsylvania, I have undergone comprehensive preparation to become an attentive and accountable educator. Serving as a teaching assistant for diverse undergraduate courses such as *Introduction to Microeconomics* (at both the Economics department at Penn and the Wharton School), *International Trade*, *International Finance*, and *Consumer Financial Decision-Making* (at Wharton), I have acquired the skills to engage with students from varied backgrounds and interests and to provide tailored guidance. These experiences have equipped me with the versatility to teach a range of courses at all levels, including but not limited to topics in Macroeconomics and Household Finance, which are also in line with my own research interest.

Motivated by the insights gained from my dissertation work, I am keen to teach topics in quantitative Macroeconomics. This subject can be taught at various levels, including undergraduate-level Intermediate Macroeconomics and graduate-level courses in heterogeneous agent models. I also envision instructing courses in Consumer and Household Finance and Macro-Finance at undergraduate, master, MBA, and Ph.D. levels, encompassing both theoretical analysis and empirical applications. Moreover, I am comfortable teaching undergraduate-level International Trade, having four years as a teaching assistant at the University of Pennsylvania and an undergraduate thesis on the subject at Brown University.

Furthermore, I am interested in developing an interdisciplinary thesis course tailored for undergraduate and master's students in Economics, Business, Sociology, and Public Policy concentrations. This course will guide students to assess the implications of pressing macroeconomic and institutional issues facing individual consumers as well as our society, and to work together on a group project designing and evaluating suitable policies to solve these problems. Potential topics that can be covered in this course include low household financial literacy, unsustainable pension systems, education and health disparities, polarization of political and social perspectives, and more. The primary objective of this course is to equip students with the expertise in analyzing and proposing solutions to complex social problems, and to foster their interdisciplinary skills through collaborative projects. As an instructor, I look forward to not only sharing my economics knowledge and analytical skills, but also learning about innovative and unique perspectives my students will bring to the table.

Beyond my interest in the subjects I would like to teach, my general teaching philosophy centers around the virtue of accountability. Accountability is the most critical principle of scholarship I learned from my advisors and fellow Ph.D. students, who were always available to discuss my research challenges and find solutions collectively. Their commitment and willingness to help not only enabled me to overcome obstacles, but also taught me that seeking assistance is not a weakness, but an opportunity for growth. To uphold the principle of accountability in my teaching, I will embrace an open-door policy. I commit to passing on what I have learned from my mentors and colleagues to my students by assuring them that no matter how much confusion they may have, my door is always open for discussion. I firmly believe that by fostering a community of support and shared responsibility, we can create an environment where both students and faculty are empowered to seek help and find solutions.

Throughout my doctoral training at the University of Pennsylvania, I have served as a graduate teaching assistant for diverse undergraduate courses including:

- Introduction to Microeconomics (Fall 2019)
- Introduction to Economics for Business (Fall 2021)
- International Finance (Fall 2020, 2022)
- International Trade (Spring 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023)
- Consumer Financial Decision Making (Fall 2023 at Wharton School)

My institution provides an official teaching evaluation record for a class that has weekly recitations. At the end of this document, I enclosed my official teaching evaluation documents for the introductory classes I served as a TA for. I would also like to share selected comments from my students from these classes:

- **Introduction to Microeconomics**

    - "Great TA, would recommend her to new micro students."
    - "Hardworking TA, communicates clearly."
    - "I enjoyed Min's TA sessions she was helpful and answered all of my questions!"
    - "Min Kim communicated well and was able to cover the recitation problems in a clear and thorough manner."

- **Introduction to Economics for Business**

    - "Min Kim was a very engaging TA that helped improve my retention of the material and its more applicable integration."
    - "I thought that the TA was great at explaining the course material. She really helped enhance my understanding of the course and would explain the material very clearly.."
    - "TA Kim was excellent. She was excellent at breaking down difficult content and she always answered students questions without hesitation. She was clearly well-educated on the course content and she kept every recitation short and simple."

For the upper-level classes I TA'd for, I would like to provide my records of "TA Quality" scores retrieved from `Penn Course Review`, which is "a student-run service that provides numerical ratings and metrics for undergraduate courses and professors at the University of Pennsylvania." The `numerical ratings` range from 0 "Poor" to 4 "Excellent":

- **International Finance**: [2020 FA] 2.16, [2022 FA] 2.50
- **International Trade**: [2020 SP] 2.90[1], [2021 SP] 3.29, [2022 SP] 2.48, [2023 SP] 3.00

I have outlined my teaching interests and philosophy in my `online teaching statement`. Thank you for your consideration.

---

[1] This course had two TAs in this term. This score represents the students' overall rating on my and my colleague TA's services.

ECON001215, Introduction to Microeconomics, Fall, 2019 — KIM, MIN

Term	**Fall, 2019 (2019C)**		Enrollment	**23**	School	**School of Arts & Sciences**
Activity Type	**REC**		Eligible	**23**	Division	**-**
Cross Listed Sections	**-**		Responses	**18**	Department	**Economics**
			Response Rate	**78%**	Subject	**Economics**

		Average Ratings				This Instructor Only Worst Rating...Best Rating					Responses
Question and Scale		Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	**Overall quality of the TA.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*	1.83	1.83	2.71	-	11% 2	33% 6	33% 6	6% 1	17% 3	18
2	**The TA communicated effectively.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.36	2.36	2.96	-	0% 0	14% 2	43% 6	36% 5	7% 1	14
3	**The TA effectively stimulated my interest.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.36	2.36	2.63	-	0% 0	14% 2	43% 6	36% 5	7% 1	14
4	**The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.77	2.77	2.96	-	0% 0	0% 0	31% 4	62% 8	8% 1	13
5	**The TA helped me to learn in this course.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.00	2.00	2.93	-	7% 1	29% 4	21% 3	43% 6	0% 0	14
6	**This recitation section was well integrated with and enhanced my understanding of the lecture material.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.57	2.57	3.07	-	0% 0	21% 3	14% 2	50% 7	14% 2	14

ECON001217, Introduction to Microeconomics, Fall, 2019   KIM, MIN

Term	**Fall, 2019 (2019C)**	Enrollment	**25**	School	**School of Arts & Sciences**
Activity Type	**REC**	Eligible	**25**	Division	**-**
Cross Listed Sections	**-**	Responses	**24**	Department	**Economics**
		Response Rate	**96%**	Subject	**Economics**

		Average Ratings				**This Instructor Only** **Worst Rating...Best Rating**					**Responses**
Question and Scale		Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	**Overall quality of the TA.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*	2.79	2.79	2.71	-	4% 1	8% 2	13% 3	54% 13	21% 5	24
2	**The TA communicated effectively.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.95	2.95	2.96	-	0% 0	11% 2	5% 1	63% 12	21% 4	19
3	**The TA effectively stimulated my interest.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.61	2.61	2.63	-	6% 1	6% 1	22% 4	56% 10	11% 2	18
4	**The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.00	3.00	2.96	-	0% 0	0% 0	26% 5	47% 9	26% 5	19
5	**The TA helped me to learn in this course.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.05	3.05	2.93	-	0% 0	5% 1	5% 1	68% 13	21% 4	19
6	**This recitation section was well integrated with and enhanced my understanding of the lecture material.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.21	3.21	3.07	-	0% 0	0% 0	11% 2	58% 11	32% 6	19

Term	**Fall, 2019 (2019C)**	Enrollment	**26**	School	**School of Arts & Sciences**
Activity Type	**REC**	Eligible	**26**	Division	**-**
Cross Listed Sections	**-**	Responses	**23**	Department	**Economics**
		Response Rate	**88%**	Subject	**Economics**

		Average Ratings				**This Instructor Only** Worst Rating...Best Rating					**Responses**
Question and Scale		Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	**Overall quality of the TA.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*	2.22	2.22	2.71	-	4% 1	17% 4	43% 10	22% 5	13% 3	23
2	**The TA communicated effectively.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.63	2.63	2.96	-	0% 0	11% 2	26% 5	53% 10	11% 2	19
3	**The TA effectively stimulated my interest.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.79	2.79	2.63	-	0% 0	11% 2	26% 5	37% 7	26% 5	19
4	**The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.89	2.89	2.96	-	0% 0	0% 0	28% 5	56% 10	17% 3	18
5	**The TA helped me to learn in this course.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.58	2.58	2.93	-	5% 1	11% 2	26% 5	37% 7	21% 4	19
6	**This recitation section was well integrated with and enhanced my understanding of the lecture material.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.83	2.83	3.07	-	6% 1	6% 1	17% 3	44% 8	28% 5	18

ECON010207, INTRO TO ECON FOR BUS, Fall, 2021 — KIM, MIN

Term	Fall, 2021 (2021C)	Enrollment	20	School	School of Arts & Sciences
Activity Type	REC	Eligible	20	Division	-
Cross Listed Sections	-	Responses	14	Department	Economics
		Response Rate	70%	Subject	Economics

		Average Ratings				This Instructor Only Worst Rating...Best Rating					Responses
	Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	**Overall quality of the TA.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*	3.14	3.14	2.65	-	0% 0	7% 1	29% 4	7% 1	57% 8	14
2	**The TA communicated effectively.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.27	3.27	2.79	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	36% 4	45% 5	11
3	**The TA effectively stimulated my interest.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.18	3.18	2.68	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	45% 5	36% 4	11
4	**The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.09	3.09	2.78	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	55% 6	27% 3	11
5	**The TA helped me to learn in this course.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.27	3.27	2.88	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	36% 4	45% 5	11
6	**This recitation section was well integrated with and enhanced my understanding of the lecture material.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.27	3.27	3.00	-	0% 0	0% 0	18% 2	36% 4	45% 5	11

Term	Fall, 2021 (2021C)	Enrollment	24	School	School of Arts & Sciences
Activity Type	REC	Eligible	24	Division	-
Cross Listed Sections	-	Responses	21	Department	Economics
		Response Rate	88%	Subject	Economics

		Average Ratings				This Instructor Only Worst Rating...Best Rating					Responses
	Question and Scale	Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	**Overall quality of the TA.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*	2.50	2.50	2.65	-	5% 1	15% 3	30% 6	25% 5	25% 5	20
2	**The TA communicated effectively.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.72	2.72	2.79	-	0% 0	6% 1	33% 6	44% 8	17% 3	18
3	**The TA effectively stimulated my interest.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.50	2.50	2.68	-	0% 0	17% 3	33% 6	33% 6	17% 3	18
4	**The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.67	2.67	2.78	-	0% 0	6% 1	33% 6	50% 9	11% 2	18
5	**The TA helped me to learn in this course.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.83	2.83	2.88	-	0% 0	11% 2	22% 4	39% 7	28% 5	18
6	**This recitation section was well integrated with and enhanced my understanding of the lecture material.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.72	2.72	3.00	-	0% 0	11% 2	28% 5	39% 7	22% 4	18

Term	**Fall, 2021 (2021C)**	Enrollment	**26**	School	**School of Arts & Sciences**
Activity Type	**REC**	Eligible	**26**	Division	**-**
Cross Listed Sections	**-**	Responses	**23**	Department	**Economics**
		Response Rate	**88%**	Subject	**Economics**

		Average Ratings				This Instructor Only Worst Rating...Best Rating					Responses
Question and Scale		Instructor	Section	Course	-	0	1	2	3	4	
1	**Overall quality of the TA.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Excellent*	2.83	2.83	2.65	-	0% 0	9% 2	35% 8	22% 5	35% 8	23
2	**The TA communicated effectively.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.00	3.00	2.79	-	0% 0	0% 0	32% 6	37% 7	32% 6	19
3	**The TA effectively stimulated my interest.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.74	2.74	2.68	-	0% 0	11% 2	26% 5	42% 8	21% 4	19
4	**The TA was appropriately accessible outside of class time.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	2.58	2.58	2.78	-	0% 0	11% 2	37% 7	37% 7	16% 3	19
5	**The TA helped me to learn in this course.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.16	3.16	2.88	-	0% 0	0% 0	16% 3	53% 10	32% 6	19
6	**This recitation section was well integrated with and enhanced my understanding of the lecture material.** *Scale: 0 to 4: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree*	3.32	3.32	3.00	-	0% 0	5% 1	0% 0	53% 10	42% 8	19