

Teaching Portfolio

College of Music, University of Colorado Boulder

Table of Contents

Introduction to Portfolio	2
Statement of Teaching Philosophy	3
Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning and Personal Teaching Evaluation.....	5
Diversity Statement	8
Curriculum Vitae	10
Appendix A: MUSC 3802 (Music History) Syllabus.....	15
Appendix B: Genre Analysis Assignment (MUSC 3802).....	21
Appendix C: 2 article response assignments from MUSC 3802	23
Appendix D: In-class article discussion MUSC 3802	28
Appendix E: MUEL 3832 (Music in Literature) Group and Individual Assignment.....	29
Appendix F: WRTG 1150 (First-Year Writing and Rhetoric) Argumentation Essay	34
Appendix G: WRTG 1150 In-Class Worksheet	41
Appendix H: Future Syllabus	44
Appendix I: Teaching Feedback.....	48

Introduction to Portfolio

I have had the privilege and unusual experience of teaching seventeen courses in two different colleges/departments during my graduate studies at the University of Colorado Boulder. Through this experience, I have had the opportunity to create many original syllabi, adapt and transform courses as I taught them multiple times, and teach both lower and upper division courses with music and non-music students. This teaching portfolio aims to unify my philosophy and training, presenting my philosophy of teaching in examples of syllabi and assignments, and to illustrate the ways my teaching values and training are used trans-disciplinarily.

The first part of the portfolio offers an overview of the concepts and values that guide my teaching. A teaching philosophy serves as an overarching introduction to some of the ideas that shape my teaching, especially KOLB learning styles and genre analysis. A diversity statement follows, discussing ways that classroom activities address issue of inclusion and representation. The statement on assessment surveys some of my evaluation techniques and opportunities I have taken advantage of to incorporate student, peer, and mentor feedback into my own teaching. A current curriculum vitae is included to present all teaching credentials in a succinct format.

The appendices illustrate how my classes work. First, a syllabus for Music History I, including an original assignment incorporating genre analysis, as discussed in my teaching philosophy and diversity statements (Appendix A and B). As evidence of ways I incorporate feedback from students mid-semester, earlier and later assignment guides for this course are also offered (Appendix C). A sample assignment from my Music and Literature course illustrates how I incorporate student-led learning into my classroom, with group and individual assignments (Appendix E). As assignment and grading rubric for first-year writing serve as examples of ways I promote student success by providing clear expectations and offering models (Appendix F; Rubrics can be found in Appendices C, E, F). Following these documents in Appendix H is a sample syllabus of a course I have designed but not yet taught. This course on intertextuality in both medieval and contemporary music integrates my experience and training in music and writing and rhetoric by examining issues of genre, audience, originality, and citation. Finally, Appendix I includes teaching feedback including a summary of Faculty Course Questionnaire data—both quantitative and qualitative, faculty and peer evaluations, and unsolicited student feedback.

Statement of Teaching Philosophy

I view my role as an instructor as that of a curator. I bring together intellectual and cultural texts for my students to make knowledge and meaning from otherwise isolated objects. As plaques in a museum help guide visitors to connect the materials they encounter in new ways, lectures and direct instruction help steer students toward new understandings. However, like visitors in an exhibit, new connections and ways of knowing are only possible by actively walking, touching, and listening to materials. My teaching is guided by the combination of intentionally crafted experience and open discovery.

Viewing teaching as curation is a concept that stems from my own research. In studying the thirteenth-century “St. Victor” manuscript, I ask why the compiler(s) of this codex assembled the diverse texts they did. What connections did they see among classical, rhetorical, theological, and musical texts? This curatorial approach is also what I hope most to teach my students. I desire to impress upon them that the scholarly works they read and the music they study are the product of cultural work and are enacting cultural work as well. They have been carefully crafted toward a specific end. I want to empower my students to think of themselves as curators; as writers and as musicians, they do not merely find information or notes and place them on the page or send their vibrations into the air, but they select, arrange, shape, and mold a reader or listener’s journey.

To facilitate an awareness for how knowledge is crafted, I teach genre analysis, a practice informed by writing pedagogy. Students assess what communication is encouraged or discouraged by a particular musical genre, who is allowed to communicate in it, what the genre is used for, and what its users seem to value. These questions necessitate an investigation of not only composers but performers, listeners, and patrons. Finally, asking who is allowed to create or use a genre, requires us to consider how ethnicity, gender, religion, class, etc. shape music’s histories. Learning to consider music this way gives students a skill they can apply to new music they encounter and works to de-colonize the music classroom. A sample genre analysis assignment (in-class, completion credit) can be found in Appendix B.

I believe that integrated, multi-style learning is optimal for all students, a philosophy especially influenced by my training in the KOLB Learning Styles Inventory as a Lead Graduate Teacher in the Graduate Teacher Program at CU Boulder. The KOLB learning style inventory suggests that, while each learner has a preferred *order* of approaches to learning, gravitating first towards reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, active experimentation, or concrete experience, engaging in all four modes has the highest learning impact. As a Lead, I consulted with graduate students, brainstorming ways they could include classroom activities and practices aimed at each of these four styles.

These experiences inspire my own work to employ multi-style learning in the classroom. Abstract conceptualization learning is motivated by understanding connections, patterns and systems. Thus, in my Music History courses, I balance broad survey with deep, detailed study. I guide students through academic musicological articles, highlighting trends and patterns in music history related to memory, oral transmission, narratives of exceptionalism or new-ness, etc. Examples of an article assignment can be found in Appendix C-D. In Music and Literature, students explore how associated

aspects of genre, politics, gender, sexuality, religion, and class affect how music functions in literature (see example group assignment, with individual writing component, in Appendix E). To incorporate reflective observation and concrete experience, learning modes that value personal connection to the material, my freshman students learn argumentation by exploring personality and implicit bias tests (see an example essay assignment and rubric in Appendix F). Using active experimentation to encourage students to question their assumptions about gender, race, and voice, in Music Appreciation, I play several musical examples, asking my students to guess the race and gender of a singer. Most students believe that they can determine a singer's bodily characteristics from their sound but begin to question this belief when their guesses are wrong. This surprise is one way I know I have accomplished my primary goal as a teacher of music: I want my students to leave my classes with an invigorated curiosity about music and the myriad ways it works in the world.

While I ask students to engage at a high level, I strive to offer the support they need to meet these expectations. Class-size permitting, I meet with students individually at least once every semester. These meetings are some of my favorite moments of the semester because I am able to welcome my students as unique individuals. Students often report that these meetings are the most useful part of a class, that they appreciate "thinking outside the box," and that they "feel more prepared for other classes," comments that suggest that they have done critical, creative, and applicable thinking in my classes.

I am invested in continually learning new teaching philosophies and pedagogical techniques and have attended over 40 workshops on teaching. In my role as a Lead Teaching Assistant for the Graduate Teacher Program, I also organized a pedagogy workshop series in the College of Music each semester, including creating and presenting workshops myself on using rubrics, linking teaching and personal research writing, and using video feedback.

My immersion in pedagogical thought across disciplines and dedication to continued development provides me with the skills and perspectives to offer unique contributions to music and writing classrooms. I aim to create environments of discovery, where students learn how to think, how to question, and where they know that the diverse aspects of their identity are both welcome and essential: to their own learning and to the learning of their peers.

Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning and Personal Teaching Evaluation

I use a variety of evaluation methods depending on the level and size of the classroom. In general, I use in-class time as a way to practice skills and explore ideas. To this end, I try to de-stress performance anxiety for these activities and emphasize growth instead. Thus, I typically make in-class assignments completion credit that comprise participation/attendance points or are full-credit portions of larger assignment grades (Examples are found in Appendices B, D, and F). In a large course of 200 students, I employed clicker questions that served to review concepts from the previous class session. In first-year writing I have employed “just-in-time” teaching methods, asking students to submit brief responses to assigned reading a few hours before class begins. These lower stakes assignments help me assess how well students are learning and absorbing the course’s material. In an upper-division Music History course, I have used genre analysis assignments as a form of active experimentation (see Teaching Philosophy). Students work on a small, individual or partnered task and then come together in a small group to complete an assignment. Each group then presents to the class so as to get a much wider understanding of a musical genre than could be accomplished by a single, out-of-class individual assignment (see an example of such as assignment in Appendix B). In first year writing, a multi-stage literature review assignment contains many out-of-class, graded elements, but is supplemented by guiding, in-class activities for completion/participation credit. This assignment combines active experimentation, as students try out new concepts on their own assembled resources as well as abstract conceptualization, as it asks them to begin making connections across articles (see Appendix G).

Because I most value student curiosity and exploration of concepts, tests and quizzes are not my primary mode of assessment, though for some courses they are necessary. In Music History and in non-majors music courses, I have employed tests to evaluate mastery of key composers, styles, or foundational music concepts. However, these are never the sole method of assessment so as to provide several different types of assignments that allow for a greater diversity of aptitudes. The majority of my out-of-class assignments include writing and/or a presentation. I often attempt to pair individual work with group work to scaffold the material and offer multiple points of engagement with it. Pairing individual and group work also offers a way for students to re-assess their own work together without the pressure of the instructor (See Appendix D for example of in-class discussion related to assignments in Appendix C) . In writing courses, I use peer-review. I have experimented with offering feedback on drafts prior to peer-review sessions so that students could discuss and question my feedback together and compare it with their peers. I have also used peer review as a first step in writing assessment, where students receive entirely non-graded feedback before I view their work.

In Music History, I assigned individual essays responding to assigned articles. 80% of this grade was based on the individual essay, while 20% was given full credit based on small group work in class. Students gathered in small groups to discuss their responses to the article in addition to discussion questions I provided. They took notes on their discussion, which completed the rest of the assignment. These notes gave them the opportunity to clarify any confusion about the articles and also gave them reminders and organization for sharing their discussion with the class. In Music in Literature, small groups of students presented background or contextual material related to each novel we read, introducing cultural aspects of music genre or instrument, political background, issues of gender or race in music at issue, etc. After gaining a broad understanding of many perspectives on music’s function in that particular work of literature, they then wrote individual essays (see example in Appendix E). They

were able to incorporate what they had learned in the group process with their own observations and interests as they read.

I also aim to respond to my students' needs and adjust my teaching and evaluative methods both across semesters and within the context of a specific class. After inviting mid-semester feedback from my Music History class, I learned that students felt frustrated and overwhelmed by the critical reading assignments. I provided class time for students to voice their concerns. I then shifted the next assignment to one of guided practice at mapping the organization and formation of argument, focusing on helping them develop the underlying skills necessary to succeed at the argumentation evaluation I had requested. An earlier assignment and the revised assignments are found in Appendix C.

For courses I have had the opportunity to teach more than once, I also try to consistently improve them across semesters paying close attention to student feedback. In Spring 2018, I decided to try grading each step of the first-year writing process, using the same rubric for drafts and final versions. I made the draft worth 20% of the overall assignment grade. I hoped that this would incentivize students to view their drafting process as valuable time that "counted," not just busy work. I also hoped that grading the drafts would incentivize higher-quality drafts and thus, with my detailed feedback, a higher level final product. Students balked at this process; seeing drafts as "practice," and an opportunity to make mistakes and then improve, they resented being held to a very high standard from the start. I also struggled with how to grade consistently between a draft of poor quality and then a final paper, which while minimally better, was still of poor quality. Conflict arose when a student's final grade did not improve.

I understood my students' frustrations in several respects, and in subsequent semesters teaching this course, I took this negative student feedback into account. I chose to grade paper drafts on a completion basis, and, to further improve initial drafting, paid more attention to the time I spent in class discussing example student papers. These changes allowed students to feel both that their time and effort were rewarded *and* that they had the opportunity to succeed. The following two semesters of teaching this course were some of my highest rated courses.

During the Spring 2019 semester, I engaged in an un-official teaching-as-research (TAR) experiment by using three different feedback methods in my first year writing course. For the first paper, students received written feedback; for the second assignment, I offered one-on-one conferences with each student. In the final assignment suite, I created feedback videos, using screen capture of their papers, scrolling through and discussing strong points and areas for improvement. At the end of the course, students completed a survey of which feedback method they felt had helped them most improve as writers. In-person and video feedback were the most preferred methods. While in-person conferences are not always practical, I plan to explore how I can incorporate more video feedback into my teaching.

I am always trying to improve my teaching and to try new things in the classroom. I do not shy away from trying new techniques I believe will help students for fear they may go badly. However, in the five years I have been teaching as a graduate student, I have grown in my ability to be flexible and to openly recognize my own shortcomings in the classroom. I have learned that I do not need to appear perfect and that if something is not working, I can change it mid-course. I have pursued peer feedback of my teaching in the form of video consultations through the Graduate Teacher Program, from my dissertation advisor, and with other instructors in the Program of Writing and Rhetoric (Appendix I). Each of these observations has given me new ideas for my teaching and made me more aware of ways I can be more

engaged with my students.

Diversity Statement

As a PhD graduate University of Colorado Boulder (CU), I am aware of my own campus' ongoing efforts to increase diversity, equity, and inclusion. In 2017, only 27% of the undergraduate population and 19% of the graduate population were minorities. More distressingly, recent campus climate surveys show that minority students, especially African-American students, do not feel comfortable or truly seen at CU. To increase the inclusion of my own classroom, I use diversity issues to teach key course concepts, have students study how course skills might impact diversity and inclusion, and use pedagogical models that encourage inclusion.

In first year writing and rhetoric, I teach the building blocks of argument—claim, reason, and warrant—by having students examine the CU website, looking at the university's definition of diversity, its stated goals and missions, and annual diversity report. Students use the statistics and categories cited in these documents to create a claim about what the university values about diversity. The class often notices that, while the CU diversity goals include many identity categories, the data they report primarily emphasize race. Students then take these observations and reflections and work together to draft proposals for CU's bi-annual Diversity and Inclusion Summit. Engagement with issues of diversity on their own campus makes students more aware of the range of obstacles faced by their classmates and encourages them to take advantage of their opportunities to make a difference. For example, one of my students submitted her proposal, was accepted, and led a workshop at the Diversity and Inclusion Summit. In other iterations of the class, students have taken implicit bias tests and learned how such tests make claims about implicit attitudes (See Appendix F). While the focus of the class is to realize the assumption underlying the experiment (warrant), that reaction time = relative comfort with an idea, students are also confronted and challenged by their results and must argue if they agree with them or not. I have found that allowing space for personal reflection and encouraging my students' critical voices fosters an open and accepting environment in my classroom.

In music courses, I endeavor to include a diverse repertory of music and scholarship from many identities and to forefront ways that gender, race, and class influence artistic output and historical narrative. My Writing about Music courses, for example, spend several classes studying the ways that the vocabulary, imagery, and frames often used in music criticism have and can perpetuate sexism, racism, and class division. I ask students, when writing reviews, to be self-reflective of which stock frames they use and why. For Music Appreciation, I organized the class—which covered overviews of western art music, American popular music, and “world” music—into themes of Music and Gender, Music and Art, Music and Technology, Music and Religion, and Music and Politics/Protest. Doing so allowed students to learn how music from a variety of traditions can, in addition to their unique characteristics, function in similar ways. In Music History, I ask students to perform genre analysis on multiple examples of a genre. From these exercises, they learn the genre's common musical traits, but, equally important, they use these traits to consider the values its creators and consumers hold, what the genre allows a person to do or not, who can use the genre, who supports its creation, etc. (See Appendix B). Genre analysis intentionally places an equal emphasis on patrons, performers, and consumers of music, which opens space to more fully integrate women and minorities into music history narratives.

Beyond integrating more diverse course material, teaching with genre analysis is one way I work to create a more equitable classroom. I show students that university discourses are practices to be

learned rather than natural talents only a select few possess. Writing pedagogue David Bartholomae argues that to succeed in a university setting, students must appear to have fluency in university discourses. While these discourses are secondary discourses to all students, some students start from a more privileged position and thus more easily transfer from their primary discourse modes to those of the university. In my writing and music courses, students look at multiple social media posts, blogs, pop songs, chants, sonatas, etc. determining what the genre's underlying rules and values are. They learn to ask questions of a genre, a domain-general skill they can then apply to less familiar genres like academic writing. Through this practice, students realize that their peers are learning how to enter the academic discourse community also, and, above all, that the discourse is learnable. It has predictable characteristics and displays values that can be imitated. I also show students how to capitalize on their status as discourse learners. When learning a new discourse, one is often more metacognitively aware of how discourses function. In my courses, therefore, I try to normalize and reward metacognitive activity by incorporating reflection activities.

Training in equitable teaching makes me mindful of the ways subtle biases arise in the classroom. Research shows that minority students and females tend to speak less often in class and thus receive less instructor attention. To make instructors more conscious of this, in my role with Graduate Teacher Program, I conducted videotape consultations that mapped teacher-student interactions, noting how frequently male, female, or minority students spoke or were spoken to by the instructor. I keep these consultations in mind as I teach, trying to intentionally invite less dominant voices to join class discussions. I am repeatedly reminded how much my quieter students have to offer, when I may have originally thought that they were unengaged. As I teach, I want to be sensitive to the extra stress and work that students of diverse backgrounds may face in learning the discourses of a university classroom. While I am intentional in the ways I forefront diversity, equity, and inclusion-related issues in my classes, as I continue in my career, I am eager to learn new ways to continue to teach more inclusively.

I have much to learn about how to best make my curriculum and classrooms accessible and inclusive to all. I am committed to doing so, as evidenced by my involvement with the GTP outlined above as well as with the American Musicological Society Pedagogy Study Group and Teaching Music History conference, where I presented a lesson plan that challenges students' racial and gendered assumptions about the human voice. I also volunteered for and attended the Conference on Community Writing which inspired many ideas for using writing to foster inclusion and diversity in communities.

Finally, as a graduate student, I have had the unfortunate experience of being a mandatory reporter and an emotional support system for a colleague involved in a multi-year case of faculty abuse. Through this experience, I have become very familiar with the university system for dealing with protected class violations, including those offices which offer full confidentiality versus those that can take investigative or disciplinary action. While I wish I did not have cause to know how these systems work, I do believe this knowledge prepares me to be a faculty advocate for my students. The power of faculty advocates is what has been impressed upon me most in this situation. Having a faculty member who believes a student's story and who will risk defending them can make a monumental difference, not only in resolving and rectifying abuse, but also in the emotional and psychological well-being of a student. I hope to use this experience to be more aware of my students' needs, to take their concerns seriously, and, when necessary, to take up their cause. I intend to use my scholastic training and available resources to remain current on issues of diversity in higher education, to listen attentively to and learn from my colleagues and my students, and to partner in already established diversity initiatives.

