

Teaching Statement

Krishna Sharma

My teaching philosophy rests on three principles: mutual learning, practical relevance, and learning from mistakes. Two Sanskrit expressions capture the values I bring to this work: "शिक्षामूलं धर्मः" (Śikṣāmūlaṁ dharmah), which I understand as "Education is the foundation of righteousness," and "अध्ययनं सर्वधर्मानां मूलम्" (Adhyayanam sarvadharmānām mūlam), "Learning is the root of all virtues." For me, these ideas connect education with responsibility: the responsibility to examine evidence carefully, listen to others, and consider how our decisions affect society. I want students to leave my classroom able to reason independently and explain the basis for their judgments.

My teaching experience spans Clemson University and Kathmandu University. At Clemson, I have taught Principles of Macroeconomics and Money and Banking, including in-person and online instruction, and served as a teaching assistant in economics. At Kathmandu University, I taught intermediate microeconomics and macroeconomics. These experiences have prepared me to teach students with different levels of quantitative training and different reasons for studying economics. My research at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, together with my work on innovation and AI governance, also informs the courses I would develop in public policy and technology policy.

I enter the classroom as both a teacher and a learner. Students bring experiences that can reveal where an explanation is incomplete or where an economic model needs further discussion. I encourage questions and invite students to explain how they reached an answer. When a student is uncertain, I want that uncertainty to become a starting point for discussion. In my Fall 2023 Money and Banking evaluation, a student noted that I encouraged participation even when students were unsure whether they were right. This is the kind of classroom relationship I seek to build: students should feel able to test an idea, listen to a different interpretation, and revise their reasoning.

Practical relevance gives students a reason to engage with difficult material. I use everyday examples, visual explanations, and classroom discussion to connect economic concepts with decisions students recognize. In macroeconomics and money and banking, this means helping students connect models to financial markets and the consequences of economic policy. Students have repeatedly identified real-world examples and explanations on the board as useful features of my teaching. I build from an accessible example toward the underlying concept, then ask students to consider how the explanation changes when an assumption changes. This approach helps make economic reasoning usable beyond the particular problem discussed in class.

Learning from mistakes is central to how I support students. My teaching has included practice problems, quizzes, review of assessed work, and individual conversations during office hours. Students in my Spring 2023 macroeconomics course described homework and quizzes as useful preparation for exams and valued opportunities to discuss errors. I want students to understand why an answer is wrong and how to improve it. In future courses, I would formalize this approach through short correction exercises requiring students to explain their original reasoning, identify the error, and apply the corrected concept to a new problem. Credit for revision would depend on evidence of learning under a clearly stated policy.

I also want assessment to reveal whether students can use what they know in an unfamiliar setting. In an introductory course, I would combine conceptual questions with short applications and interpretation of graphs or data. In an advanced course, I would place greater weight on independent analysis, written arguments, and the ability to evaluate evidence. A policy assignment, for example, could ask students to recommend an intervention, specify the mechanism through which it should work, and explain how its effects could be measured. Assessment criteria would reward sound reasoning and appropriate treatment of uncertainty, including when a student reaches a conclusion different from my own.

My evaluations provide evidence of strengths and a useful basis for improvement. The reported overall averages were 4.02 out of 5 in Fall 2022 Principles of Macroeconomics, 4.50 in Spring 2023 Principles of Macroeconomics, and 4.62 in Fall 2023 Money and Banking, with response rates of 84 percent, 83.2 percent, and 100 percent, respectively. These reports cover different classes and, in Fall 2023, different evaluation questions. I therefore read them alongside the written feedback. Students consistently valued my availability, patience, and commitment to their understanding. I also received Clemson's Fall 2021 Student-Nominated TA of the Semester award, formally recognized by the Undergraduate Student Senate in February 2022.

The feedback also identifies areas I would address deliberately in my next courses. Some students found the pace too fast, instructions difficult to follow, or the relationship between slides and board work unclear. I would organize course materials into consistent weekly modules, publish assessment dates in advance, and provide brief summaries of important board work. During lectures, I would pause after complex graphs or equations and use short questions to check understanding. Comments about limited challenge in some assessments also reinforce the need to include problems that test transfer to new situations. My aim is to preserve an approachable classroom while making expectations and standards clear.

My developing teaching agenda connects economics with public policy, innovation, and the governance of technology. Research on university technology transfer offers a way to examine how institutional rules influence the movement of ideas from research to practical use. My work on return migration and entrepreneurship raises questions about how skills, networks, and local institutions shape innovation. Research on AI trust and accountability adds questions about adoption, public confidence, and institutional responsibility. I would bring these topics into teaching through carefully selected readings and cases, with a clear distinction between established findings, ongoing research, and open questions.

In a course on the economics of innovation or technology policy, students could compare university intellectual property policies, examine incentives facing researchers and firms, or evaluate the design of public research funding. A possible assignment would ask students to compare two approaches to technology transfer and explain their likely effects on disclosure, commercialization, and access. Students would need to consider what evidence could support their conclusions and what alternative explanations remain. Depending on the course level, the exercise could develop into a short empirical project using accessible data on research activity, patents, or entrepreneurship.

In AI governance, I would teach from an economics and institutional perspective. A course could examine incentives for adoption, accountability for errors, effects on workers, and the distribution of benefits. One case might ask whether a public agency should use an AI system to assist with a service decision. Students would assess the problem being addressed, the evidence needed to evaluate performance, and the arrangements for human review and appeal. In a simulated policy hearing, they could represent affected residents, public officials, workers, or technology providers. A subsequent individual memo would require each student to defend a recommendation and respond to the strongest objection.

Responsible use of AI would also be part of my course design. I would state when AI assistance is permitted, require disclosure of its use, and hold students responsible for verifying sources and calculations. Selected assignments would compare an AI-generated explanation with primary evidence or require students to explain their analysis orally. Students with less technical preparation would have access to introductory materials and guided examples, while more advanced students could pursue extensions. My experience teaching in Nepal and the United States would inform my choice of cases, especially when institutional capacity or access to technology changes which policy options are feasible.

I am prepared to contribute to undergraduate teaching in macroeconomics, money and banking, and intermediate economic theory, and to courses in public policy and applied economic analysis. I would welcome opportunities to develop advanced undergraduate or graduate electives in the economics of innovation, technology policy, and AI governance, matched to the program's needs. In mentoring student research, I would help students narrow a question, identify feasible evidence, and communicate what their findings do and do not establish. Across these settings, I want students to become comfortable asking difficult questions and sufficiently disciplined to work toward defensible answers.