

Teaching Dossier

Rima Hussein

Contents

1	Teaching Statement	2
2	Sample Syllabi	4
2.1	Kant's Theoretical Philosophy (S 2021)	4
2.2	Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality: Intersectional Feminist Philosophy (S 2019, F 2021)	8
2.3	Introduction to Philosophy of Race (Course Proposal)	15
3	Teaching Evaluations	19
3.1	Quantitative Data: Global Assessments	19
3.2	Qualitative and Quantitative Assessments for Kant's Theoretical Philosophy	20
3.3	Qualitative and Quantitative Assessments for Intersectional Feminist Philosophy	23
3.4	Selection of Assessments as a Teaching Assistant	30

1 Teaching Statement

In my classroom, I ask my students to cooperate. This is not a simple task. As I understand philosophy, it is the practice of critical thinking about what the world is fundamentally like or about what we should do. Given this understanding of philosophy as thinking, it is essentially an inward activity. Many students concur. They come to the classroom with the expectation to answer questions by introspection. Why, then, should we care if they collaborate? Simply put, what we are engaged in is not idle inquiry, but it becomes philosophy when a serious attempt is made to answer these questions successfully. Further, a philosophical answer to any question ought to be communicable to others. It should build upon the knowledge, experience, and insight of others. And last, any claim about either what the case is or what we should do must be expressed with the goal for it to be accepted as correct, convincing, and meaningful *to* others.

My collaborative approach is reflected both in the graded work I assign, and in the activities I have designed for class. Some small group assignments had been highly effective. For instance, I frequently ask students to compare Locke's Prince and Cobbler thought experiment with Kant's claim that these conscious experiences even when identical could have belonged to another person. Sometimes collaboration works best by bringing out students' competitive spirit and pitting teams against one another. Sometimes it works best when I articulate an infuriatingly wrong claim and give the class a few minutes to tell me exactly why I am so wrong to claim that social constructions only affect people too weak-willed to construct something else. Students bond over proving me wrong together; it strengthens their trust and reliance on each other. My graded assignments are typically designed to closely mimic the process of composing academic work. Much like the capacity to collaborate in person and on the spot, skills of academic philosophers are professional skills apt for deployment in most collaborative work environments. I assign the most recent contributions to the field as readings and ask students to design a paper that understands itself as a contribution to a small area of research. As part of the writing process, I assign several steps towards the completion of a paper. Students are familiarized with the processes of abstract and exposé writing, bibliography composition, conference-style presentation and commentary, and peer review. I know from my years working in publishing that these activities involve mastering how to cooperate in a professional environment. Students learn how to meet a deadline for a large project by completing several smaller tasks, which all involve giving and receiving constructive feedback. They learn how to successfully adapt strategies when a project is stalled, they learn to ask for help and to receive it, and to appreciate even the smallest support. What helps me assess whether students have been successful in their work is the completed research paper. Of course, in such a course, students do not succeed without close advising and mentoring, attention to their individual progress, and – particularly for those students who are not familiar with the academic world – repeated encouragement and prompting for meetings which I offer in office hours and over zoom or email.

My classes in the history of philosophy offer unique methodological training. Since historiographical methods are seldom taught in philosophy but are required for mastering a research paper in the history of philosophy, I adapted standard methods from other historical fields to fit the philosophical purpose. Our core evidence is text, so students train their capacities for instance by reflecting on how to gather evidence from primary source material, how to deal with syntactic and semantic shifts as well as semantic ambiguities in historical texts, how to reconstruct an argument, and how to adapt, or defend an interpretation of a view. However, philosophers working in the history of philosophy differ from many other historical disciplines in a few ways. As philosophers,

we often investigate history from the standpoint of our current issues. We ask, for instance, if Kant had anything interesting to say about a problem in the philosophy of space that remains unanswered. As a consequence, our writing is often concerned with presenting thought from the history of philosophy in a manner that poses forgotten or unknown views as viable alternatives to current questions. In short, we do history of philosophy not only as history but *as* philosophy. My class in Kant's theoretical philosophy, for instance, taught students these skills by showing them how to distill both isolated and interconnected philosophical claims from the letter of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, and reshape them into things like papers on vagueness in "I"-statements, perceptible qualities of objects, and the irreversibility of temporal order.

My conceptually oriented classes instruct students in problem-solving. At Hopkins, I taught a course entitled "Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality: Intersectional Feminist Philosophy" in which I asked students to employ conceptual analysis to reflect on problems in contemporary feminism. This course specifically concerned one of the most prominent worries in recent feminist philosophy, the worry that feminist philosophy—a collective endeavor directed against oppression and marginalization—is itself an expression and tool of marginalization and oppression. This worry was expressed time and time again during the course of decades of debate, critique and intervention within feminist philosophy and activism. If true, this is a problem – perhaps a problem apt for philosophical solving. The course traced some of this debate by focusing on the main epistemic and metaphysical throughlines: What is the relevance of the definition of *woman* for feminist philosophy and feminist activism? Do we approach the world and how we know it from the vantage of our social identities? How would we contend with the possibility that we do? And how do we understand the structure of social identity and oppression if we make room for the possibility that race, class, gender, and sexuality could not just intersect but essentially alter the expression of one another? In this class, students often managed to articulate problems and compose essays that held personal significance for them. As a result, they engaged in careful and considerate thought and took these issues extremely seriously.

I have very much enjoyed teaching classes these classes and would be delighted to expand on my teaching activities in your department. Looking forward, I would like to continue developing syllabi in Kant's natural philosophy, his practical philosophy, and his aesthetics, and more generally in the theoretical philosophy of the Early Moderns and post-Kantian Germans. In addition, I have long wanted to develop courses in the philosophy of race, a proposal for which is appended to the sample syllabi in this dossier. The proposed class "Introduction to Philosophy of Race" is intended to be a systematic and historical introduction to race and racism.

My teaching has been met with great appreciation from the university and from my students. I have been awarded two fellowships for my course in intersectional feminist philosophy and one fellowship for my course in Kant's theoretical philosophy. In addition to these fellowships, my teaching has been recognized by the Johns Hopkins Student Government Association through the George. E. Owen Teaching Award for excellent teaching. My teaching activity has also been a great source of joy for me. My students' passionate partiality for what we do makes patent to me the ongoing emancipatory force of clear, considered thought. It also shows me that overall, philosophy is done well when done together as a collective inquiry into what is public and shared among all of us.

2 Sample Syllabi

2.1 Kant's Theoretical Philosophy (Spring 2021)

Instructor: Rima Hussein, rima.hussein@jhu.edu

Class time and location: Wednesdays, 4.00 pm – 6.30 pm

<https://JHUBlueJays.zoom.us/j/91372848527?pwd=c2ZxZ1BBWTBkRHZnZ1JedW9meEdkdz09>

Meeting ID: 913 7284 8527

Passcode: 014902

Office hours: Mondays 2.30 – 3.30pm, Wednesdays, 6.30 – 7.00 pm.

<https://JHUBlueJays.zoom.us/j/95096151937?pwd=SzhubXRwSDJBVEhVbG5Ga2FuTzhldz09>

Meeting ID: 950 9615 1937

Passcode: 712398

This course satisfies the modern philosophy and theory of knowledge requirements for philosophy majors. All students are welcome.

Main Learning Outcomes:

- By the end of the course, you can expect to have an overview of Kant's theoretical philosophy.
- You will also have learned how to articulate an independent research project on a historical topic and how to express your research goals in a manageable way even in light of a vast and lively scholarly debate on the issue.

Requirements:

- Students are required to do **all the readings** unless it is indicated on the syllabus that they are merely recommended. Students are required to have a pdf of class readings open while in class. They are also asked to mute non-essential notifications and keep other tabs closed. Students are also required to **attend actively and write a reading response** on each session (**20% of final grade**). Attending actively means to follow class discussion, participate by expressing your questions and opinions, and listen to and consider other students' contributions.
- Students are required to compose a **three-page exposé** and an **annotated bibliography** of a half page for their final paper on a topic in Kant's theoretical philosophy by **February 28, 2021, 11:59 pm**. The exposé **must contain the basic argumentative strategy of the paper (25% of final grade)**. Students must compose an annotated bibliography containing at least three and no more than seven texts the students intend to use in their final essay. The exposé and bibliography are single-spaced (in contrast to the final paper). Guidelines for composing exposés, philosophical writing and annotated bibliographies will be provided. I will give extensive comments on this exposé and aid in developing the paper.
- Students are required to hand in a **draft** for their final paper by **April 14, 2021, 11:59 pm**. The draft is a double-spaced written document. I will not grade this draft.
- Students are required to **review a peer's** first draft of their final essay by **April 29, 2021, 11:59 pm**. A questionnaire for this peer-review will be provided, you will need to fill out a single form (**15% of final grade**).

- Students are required to hand in a **final 15–page essay** by **May 5, 2021 (40% of final grade)**. The final paper is a double–spaced written document.

A Note on Introductory Readings and Secondary Literature:

There is no shortage in writings on Kant’s theoretical philosophy. It is by no means an exaggeration to say that it is not humanly possible to read everything that has been published on Kant’s theoretical philosophy within a lifetime. I do not recommend seeking out introductory readings on the topic on your own. However, there are many merits to following the text alongside a good commentary. Good systematic overviews are provided in the *Cambridge Companions*, the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, as well as the *Kant Dictionary* and Julian Wuerth’s *Kant Lexicon*. The latter will be published on February 25, 2021, but it looks like a significant improvement on Caygill’s *Dictionary*. Do not “google it,” do not independently pursue a search in the secondary literature. You will waste your time on terrible takes.

There is no expectation that you do additional readings (beyond what is assigned or recommended in the list below) as you prepare to write your papers. However, you are certainly welcome to do so (subject to the cautions about plagiarism – see below). You are also strongly encouraged to come to me for further recommendations and will be provided active assistance when articulating your exposé and annotated bibliography.

Prospective Course Program

Wednesday, January 27, 2021.

Introduction of course participants and instructor. Presentation of course material and requirements. Reasoning exercises.

Wednesday, February 3, 2021.

Lecture: “How is Metaphysics Possible?”

Reading: Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the preface and the introduction to the A edition.

Some additional optional readings, all of which can be found in the folder titled “Selected Secondary Literature” on Blackboard. Please select the optional readings in accordance with your own intellectual needs after a first round of reading the primary material.

- For a **general introduction** to Kant’s works consider supplementing your reading with Paul Guyer, *The Starry Heavens and the Moral Law* in the 1992 *Cambridge Companion to Kant*.
- If you are more interested in understanding the project of the ***Critique of Pure Reason***, I recommend reading Part 1 of P.F. Strawson’s *Bounds of Sense*.
- If you are interested in understanding more about the **mechanics of the introduction more specifically**, I recommend R. Lanier Anderson’s chapter on the *Introduction* in the 2010 *Cambridge Companion to Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason*.
- For a step–by–step walk through the **A–Preface** read Norman Kemp Smith’s *Commentary to Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason* in which Kemp Smith discusses details in great detail on pp. 8–16.

Wednesday, February 10, 2021.

Lecture: “Two Kinds of Cognition in Experience”

Reading: Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Transcendental Aesthetic*

Recommended:

Lucy Allais, *Kant’s Argument for Transcendental Idealism in the Transcendental Aesthetic*, in: *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, New Series, Vol. 110 (2010), pp. 47–75.

P.F. Strawson’s *Bounds of Sense*, p. 51 ff.

Wednesday, February 17, 2021.

Lecture: “How is Knowledge Possible?”

Reading: Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Transcendental Logic*.

Recommended: Dieter Henrich, *The Two-Step Deduction in the Transcendental Logic*.

Wednesday, February 24, 2021.

Lecture: “The Constitution of Experience”

Reading: Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Analytic of Principles* up until and including the *Schematism*.

Wednesday, March 3, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read up until and including the *Axioms of Intuition*.

Wednesday, March 10, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read up until and including the *Analogies of Experience*.

Wednesday, March 17, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the chapter on *Phenomena and Noumena* and the *Amphiboly*. A 235–292.

Wednesday, March 24, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Paralogism* – up until and including A 405.

Focus on the fourth paralogism.

Wednesday, March 31, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Antinomies* – up until and including A 572.

Focus on the first antinomy.

Wednesday, April 7, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Natural Dialectic* – up until and including A 704. **As well as** the *Preface* to the *Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science*.

Wednesday, April 14, 2021. No class – “Spring Break”

Wednesday, April 21, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *B-Deduction*.

Wednesday, April 28, 2021.

Reading: Kant, I. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Please read the *Refutation of Idealism* and the *B-Paralogism*
Focus on B 406, 411, 420 , 422.

Accommodations

For disability accommodations, the university manages these issues centrally here studentdisabilityservices@jhu.edu. Feel free to contact me for further information. For better communication I strongly encourage students to turn on their videos to speak since it can be difficult to gauge someone else's contribution over this imperfect medium.

Religious Accommodations

If you anticipate needing accommodations for religious reasons, including time off for religious holidays, please contact me as soon as possible.

Readings.

The readings will be uploaded to Blackboard.

Website.

The course web site is very basic. It will be used to post readings and reading responses. It will also be used to post assignments and other occasional information, and to keep the syllabus permanently accessible to everyone. In addition, it contains some guidelines about writing philosophy papers, exposés and annotated bibliographies and about how to review a peer. To access the web site, go to <http://blackboard.jhu.edu>, click on the Login link, and enter your JHED User ID and password. If you are registered for the course, it should appear as one of the courses on your list.

Don't cheat.

The following is the language, relating to academic ethics, that the university recommends be included on all course syllabi:

“Cheating is wrong. Cheating hurts our community by undermining academic integrity, creating mistrust, and fostering unfair competition. The university will punish cheaters with failure on an assignment, failure in a course, permanent transcript notation, suspension, and/or expulsion. Offenses may be reported to medical, law or other professional or graduate schools when a cheater applies.

Violations can include cheating on exams, plagiarism, reuse of assignments without permission, improper use of the Internet and electronic devices, unauthorized collaboration, alteration of graded assignments, forgery and falsification, lying, facilitating academic dishonesty, and unfair competition. Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse.”

I take this very seriously and will not tolerate cheating under any circumstances. It undermines trust and respect, two necessary elements of any functioning community, academic or otherwise. Please note: plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of other people's writings – including materials copied from the web – whether or not you quote them word for word.

2.2 Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality: Intersectional Feminist Philosophy (Spring 2019, Fall 2021)

Instructor: Rima Hussein

Office hours: Tuesdays, 3pm – 4pm, Gilman Hall, 269a.

This course is about a prominent worry in feminist philosophy, the worry that feminist philosophy is itself suppressing aberrant voices. Though feminist philosophy understands itself to be a project in social justice, feminist philosophers were passively and actively involved in the perpetuation of injustice directed at people of color, non-heterosexual people, trans* and gender non-conforming people, disabled people, working class people etc. This is the criticism. This course is an introduction into a project that seeks to overcome any implicit or explicit exclusionary tendencies in feminist thought. This intellectual and political project is commonly called “intersectional feminism.” First coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw, this term describes an analytical perspective in which issues of social justice are understood from the perspective of at least two intersecting axes of oppression.

We will approach the topic in three phases. During our first phase, we will dive into a few texts which investigate what exactly it can mean to *bear* voices at the margins. How does this epistemic marginalization occur and how do we counteract it? Is it a matter of simple inclusion? In this phase, we will introduce some major themes in intersectional feminist thought. This focus on the epistemological dimension of oppression will also prepare us for what’s to come. We will try to attune ourselves to the more specific analyses of oppression resulting from an intersectional perspective during the second phase of the class. Since the works under investigation are created for the purpose of social justice, we will finally, during the third phase, move to what this means for our praxis.

Since some of these texts are very rich and dense, I will end each class with a five-minutes lecture that is meant to give guidance on what to focus your reading on in preparation of the upcoming class. In addition to this, the coursework itself is designed to help you navigate these materials. So, all students are welcome.

This course satisfies the theory requirement for Women, Gender and Sexuality majors and the political philosophy requirement for philosophy majors.

Learning outcomes

By the end of the course, you can expect to have a basic understanding of some main issues in feminist philosophy. Themes under investigation are: The epistemological dimension of oppression, the origins of gendered and racialized capitalist oppression, the gendered nature of slavery, the body, heterosexisms, family, the racialized experience, and how to let political action be informed by this theoretical movement (and *vice versa!*). Philosophy courses in general – and this one is no exception – can also help your intellectual growth in a number of ways: you will be encouraged to develop your reflective abilities, your skills at presenting arguments for your positions (both in writing and in discussion), and at anticipating and responding to counterarguments to those positions. You will gain awareness of the complexity of philosophical issues within their political context. Finally, the coursework is designed to enable you to design and pursue independent research and write a final paper that reflects your own engagement with the thought.

Recommended introduction

Watch a film!

Lizzie Borden, *Born in Flames* (1983).
Beyoncé, Khalil Joseph, et al., *Lemonade* (2016). Note: watch the visual album.
Julie Dash, *Daughters of the Dust* (1991).
Jonathan Demme, *Beloved* (1998).
Jim Hubbard, *United in Anger: A History of ACT UP* (2012).
Jennie Livingston, *Paris is Burning* (1990).
Trinh Thi Minh Hà, *Surname Việt, Given Name Nam* (1989).

Prospective Course Program

Part 1: A Foundation of Feminist Philosophy: Hearing the Voices from the Margins

Tuesday, September 1, 2020

Introduction of course participants and instructor. Presentation of course material and requirements. Introductory overview lecture on the location of intersectional feminism within the larger history of feminist philosophy. Emphasis will be placed on the role of Black feminist epistemology in feminist philosophy. Black feminist epistemology here is portrayed as a tool to enable a more socially inclusive thought.

Learning goal

Students will get introduced to intersectional feminist philosophy as (in part) pursuing epistemic justice. Students will also become familiar with the idea that failures in understanding and communication can have social origins.

Five–minutes lecture: Black Feminist Epistemology as a Foundation of Intersectional Frameworks

Thursday, September 3, 2020

Reading

Patricia Hill Collins, ‘Black Feminist Epistemology’, in *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, 2nd edition, edited by Patricia Hill Collins (New York: Routledge: 2000), pp. 251 – 256 and 266–271.

Five–minutes lecture: What is Epistemic Injustice? What is Testimonial Injustice?

Tuesday, September 8, 2020

Reading

Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 9–29.

Five–minutes lecture: What is Hermeneutic Injustice?

Thursday, September 10, 2020

Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 147–169.

Five–minutes lecture: What is Epistemic Oppression?

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Kristie Dotson, ‘Conceptualizing Epistemic Oppression’, *Social Epistemology* volume 28, issue 2 (January 2014): pp. 115 – 138.

Five–minutes lecture: The Framework for this Class: Some Epistemological Foundations of Intersectional Feminism

Thursday, September 17, 2020.

Kristie Dotson, 'Conceptualizing Epistemic Oppression', *Social Epistemology* volume 28, issue 2 (January 2014): pp. 115 – 138.

Trinh Thi Minh Hà, *Woman, Native, Other*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), pp. 15–20.
Five–minutes lecture: Intersectionality as a Framework of Class Analysis

Tuesday, September 22, 2020 – Library workshop with Heidi Herr, location TBD

During this workshop, students will learn some practical tools for library research.

Preparation

Familiarize yourself with this library guide that was designed specifically for this class:

<https://guides.library.jhu.edu/philosophy/intersectional>

Note:

Heidi is a wonderful, kind, and exceptionally helpful librarian. In this session she will guide us through how to approach i. our research process more generally, ii. How to narrow and broaden a research topic, and finally iii., the use of keywords within this research process. She is always *excited* to help us out on our journey, so, make sure to let her help you.

Part 2: Intersectional Frameworks

Class

Thursday, September 24, 2020

Gloria Anzaldúa, 'The Homeland, Aztlán/ El otro México' in *Borderlands/ La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Pp. 23 – 35.

Silvia Federici, 'Colonization and Christianization' in *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Pp. 219–239.

Five–minutes lecture: Really? *All History is a History of Class Struggle?*

Tuesday, September 29, 2020

Davis, Angela, 'The Legacy of Slavery: Standards for a New Womanhood' in *Women, Race, and Class*, (New York: Randomhouse, 1981), pp. 3 – 29.

Five–minutes lecture: What is a Slur?

Race

Thursday, October 1, 2020

Frantz Fanon, 'The Lived Experience of the Black Man', in *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 2008), pp. 89 – 119. N.B.: Please make sure to read *this* translation instead of the older one.

Five–minutes lecture: On Family

Tuesday, October 6, 2020

bell hooks, 'The Significance of Feminist Movement', in *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* (New York: Routledge, 2015), pp. 34–42.

Thelathia Nikki Young, 'Deconstructing "Family" and Race Politics', in *Black Queer Ethics, Family, and Philosophical Imagination* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 92–96.

Thelathia Nikki Young, 'Capitalism and the Family', in *Black Queer Ethics, Family, and Philosophical Imagination* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), pp. 111–120.

Five–minutes lecture: The Strategy to Denaturalize Gender and Race

Gender and Sexuality

Thursday, October 8, 2020

Judith Butler, 'Phantasmic Identification and the Assumption of Sex', in *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (New York: Routledge, 1993), pp. 93 – 120.

Five–minutes lecture: Why is Homophobia Centered Around Protecting Masculinity? Boundaries of Gender that Serve as Boundaries of Sexuality

Tuesday, October 13, 2020

Leo Bersani, 'Is the Rectum a Grave?' in *October*, Vol. 43, *AIDS: Cultural Analysis/Cultural Activism*. Pp. 197 – 222.

Five–minutes lecture: The Body as a Battleground

Thursday, October 15, 2020

Carmen Maria Macado, 'The Husband Stitch' in *Her Body and Other Parties* (Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2017), pp. 13–37.

Five–minutes lecture: What is Materialism?

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Emma Heaney, 'Materialist Trans Feminism Against Queer Theory' in *The New Woman: Literary Modernism, Queer Theory, and the Trans Feminine Allegory* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2017), pp. 253–297.

Five–minutes lecture: Summary: Perspectives on Sexuality I

Thursday, October 22, 2020

James Baldwin, "'Go the Way Your Blood Beats": An Interview with James Baldwin' in *The Last Interview and Other Conversations* (Brooklyn: Melville House, 2014), pp. 59–74.

Five–minutes lecture: Summary: Perspectives on Sexuality II

Tuesday, October 27, 2020

Leslie Feinberg, *Stone Butch Blues* (New York: Alyson Books, 2014), pp. 50–84. *Note:* It is really worth reading the novel.

Five–minutes lecture: What is Praxis?

Part 3: Praxis

Thursday, October 29, 2020

11tanford maree brown, *Pleasure Activism: The Politics of Feeling Good* (Chicago: AK Press, 2019), pp. 4–13.

Audre Lorde, 'Uses of the Erotic: The Erotic as Power', in *Pleasure Activism: The Politics of Feeling Good* (Chicago: AK Press, 2019), pp. 18–22.

Exposé due: Please hand in a print–out of your exposé and annotated bibliography in class.

Tuesday, November 3, 2020 – Election Day. No Class.

Thursday, November 5, 2020

In–class reading: Adrienne Rich, 'I Dream I'm the Death of Orpheus', in *The Will to Change: Poems 1968–1970* (W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.: New York, 1971), p. 19.

Five–minutes lecture: The Home as a Political Battleground

Tuesday, November 10, 2020

Silvia Federici, 'Wages Against Housework' in *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle* (CM Press: Oakland, 2012), pp. 15–22.
Five–minutes lecture: Non–Profits, Charities, and Prisons

Thursday, November 12, 2020.

Ruthie Wilson Gilmore 'In the Shadow of the Shadow State' in *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non–Profit Industrial Complex* (South End Press: Cambridge, 2007). Pp. 41–52.
Five–minutes lecture: Bureaucracy and Death: I

Tuesday, November 17, 2020

Sylvia Wynter, "“No Humans Involved”": An Open Letter to My Colleagues' in *Forum N.H.I.: Knowledge for the 21st Century*, Vol 1. Nr. 1, 1994, pp. 42–71.
Five–minutes lecture: Bureaucracy and Death: II

Thursday, November 19, 2020

Conversation with Dean Spade. Q&A with Dean Spade about the Silvia Rivera Project and the challenges for trans* women of color and trans* sex workers in U.S. Metropolitan areas.
Dean Spade, *Normal Life : Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law* (Duke University Press: Durham, 2015) pp. 1–20.
Five–minutes lecture: The Role of Optimism

Drafts due. Please upload an electronic copy to Blackboard by November 22, 23:59 pm.

Tuesday, December 1, 2020

bell hooks, 'To Love Again: The Heart of Feminism' in *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics* (Routledge: New York, 2015), pp. 100–104.
Bell hooks, 'Visionary Feminism' in *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics* (Routledge: New York, 2015), pp. 110–118.

Peer reviews due. Please upload an electronic copy to Blackboard by December 1, 23:59 pm.

Thursday, December 3, 2020

bell hooks, 'Seeking Truth' in *Sisters of the Yam: Black Women and Self–Recovery* (South End Press: Cambridge, 2005), pp. 11–20.

Final paper due. Please upload an electronic copy to Blackboard by December 1, 23:59 pm.

Requirements

You are required to do **all the readings** unless it is indicated on the syllabus that they are merely recommended. You are required to bring a paper copy of the readings to class (no laptops or electronics in the classroom). They are available on Blackboard.

You are required to **read the reading guide** (it is on Blackboard) **before doing the readings** and **articulate an answer to one (or all) of the questions** in the reading guide (**20% of final grade**).

Students are required to compose a **three–page exposé** and an **annotated bibliography** for their final paper on a topic in feminist theory by **October 29, 2020**. They are **required** to talk to me in office hours about this project to clarify their main question.

The exposé must contain the basic argumentative strategy of the paper. Students must compose an annotated bibliography containing at least three and no more than seven texts the students intend to use in their final essay. A guideline for composing exposés, philosophical writing and annotated bibliographies will be provided **(25% of final grade)**.

Students are required to hand in a **draft** for their final paper by **November 19, 2020**. I will give extensive comments on this draft but won't grade it.

Students are required to **review** a **peer's** first draft of their final essay by **December 1, 2020**. A guideline and a questionnaire for peer–review will be provided **(15% of final grade)**.

Students are required to hand in a **final 15–page essay** due **December 10, 2020** electronically **(40% of final grade)**.

If you would like extra credit, please talk to me during office hours. If you would like to create a project of a different form (visual media, music, etc.), I'd love that. So, please talk to me about this during my office hours.

Accommodations

This is from Prof. Taylor's syllabus.

“Disability Accommodations

If you have a disability and anticipate needing accommodations in this class, please obtain an accommodation letter from Student Disability Services, 385 Garland, (410) 516–4720, studentdisabilityservices@jhu.edu. Feel free to contact the instructor for further information.

Religious Accommodations

If you anticipate needing accommodations for religious reasons, including time off for religious holidays, please contact the instructor as soon as possible.”

Content

We will be talking about **sex, love, joy**, but also **oppression, physical and emotional violence** (in moderation), and **hardship**. Part of this is in the nature of the question at the heart of this class. But gratuitous displays of violence are not conducive to an open and honest inquiry. It may shut off people's curiosity and I would like to avoid it. If you notice this type of gratuitous display of violence in the material, I ask you to point me to it, so that I can make accommodations and arrange for alternative material. Sensitivity around this type of content varies, so I am trusting you to point these things out to me, in case I fail to notice.

Readings

The readings will be uploaded to Blackboard.

Website

The course web site is very basic. It will be used to post readings. It will also be used to post assignments and other occasional information, and to keep the syllabus permanently accessible to everyone. In addition, it contains some guidelines about writing philosophy papers, exposés and annotated bibliographies and about how to review a peer. Finally, students should upload their drafts and final papers to the plagiarism software tool on Blackboard (Turnitin) in order to hand in their work. To access the web site, go to <http://blackboard.jhu.edu>, click on the Login link, and enter your JHED User ID and password. If you are registered for the course, it should appear as one of the courses on your list.

Note on further readings

There is no expectation that you do additional reading (i.e. beyond what is assigned in the list above) as you prepare to write your papers. However, you are certainly welcome to do so (subject to the cautions about plagiarism – see below). A good starting–point for additional philosophy readings is the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (<http://plato.stanford.edu/>). The articles here are by acknowledged experts and are updated every four years in light of new scholarship; they also contain useful bibliographies and links to related articles in the encyclopedia itself. I do not recommend Wikipedia articles, which are unreliable when it comes to philosophical details. If you intend to use material that is neither published through an academic press nor peer–reviewed you should make a good–faith effort to find reliable information. A simple click on the first result of a Google search is not enough.

Here are a few reference and overview works for the topic of our class:

Hancock, A. M. *Intersectionality. An Intellectual History*. Oxford: 2016.

Alcoff, L. M. *Visible Identities. Race, Gender and the Self*. Oxford: 2005.

Hill Collins, P. and S. Bilge *Intersectionality. (Key Concepts)*. Cambridge/Malden: 2016.

Boo, cheating.

The following is the language, relating to academic ethics, that the university recommends be included on all course syllabi:

“Cheating is wrong. Cheating hurts our community by undermining academic integrity, creating mistrust, and fostering unfair competition. The university will punish cheaters with failure on an assignment, failure in a course, permanent transcript notation, suspension, and/or expulsion. Offenses may be reported to medical, law or other professional or graduate schools when a cheater applies.

Violations can include cheating on exams, plagiarism, reuse of assignments without permission, improper use of the Internet and electronic devices, unauthorized collaboration, alteration of graded assignments, forgery and falsification, lying, facilitating academic dishonesty, and unfair competition. Ignorance of these rules is not an excuse.”

I take this very seriously and will not tolerate cheating under any circumstances. It undermines trust and respect, two necessary elements of any functioning community, academic or otherwise. Please note: plagiarism is the unacknowledged use of other people’s writings – including materials copied from the web – whether or not you quote them word for word.

2.3 Introduction to Philosophy of Race (Course Proposal)

Instructor: Rima Hussein
Office: xxx

Office Hours: xx, or by appointment
Email: rima.hussein@jhu.edu

Course Description:

What is racism? What is race? Frequently, we hurry past these questions to answer the more urgent question: How do we free ourselves of racism? But just as frequently we find ourselves unable to answer it, in part, because we lack clarity on the phenomenon, its origins, and the ways it is sustained in society despite an overwhelming desire to live in a society free of racism. This course seeks to examine race and racism from a philosophical perspective. We ask questions about what race and racism are and how they are involved in creating realities for individuals and groups of people. This is a class in philosophy, and as such, students can expect to learn basic skills in philosophical argumentation and criticism. The class readings are dense, but the instructor will provide a short overview of the argument presented at the outset of each session. Students are not expected to have taken a prior class in philosophy.

Students with Disabilities:

[University policy]

Academic Integrity:

[University policy]

Electronics:

Students are asked to turn off all apps and browser windows that are not related to class material. I recommend taking a break from electronics for these hours of the week.

Course Requirements and Grade Distribution:

Reasoning test (5%), in-class participation and weekly reading responses (10%), a midterm exam (20%) and two essays (25% and 35%) based on class materials. Essay questions are handed out two weeks in advance.

1. **Reasoning test.** After our initial sessions, I will administer a short test to ensure that students master basic formal reasoning skills. The test consists of a few T/F questions and a few simple exercises.
2. **In-class participation and reading responses.** Although I will introduce class materials with short lectures every week, the class itself is discussion based. To make sure class discussion reflects student interest, students are required to articulate one short (!) question per week concerning the readings and upload the question to the online teaching portal the day before class by noon.
3. **Midterm.** A midterm exam will be held on mm/dd/yyyy. The midterm consists of a few T/F questions and a short essay.
4. **Essays.** Students will write two short philosophical essays (5–6 pages) due on mm/dd/yyyy and on mm/dd/yyyy. Students chose between provided essay questions. Advanced students who intend to write a qualifying thesis in the philosophy of race or in an adjacent field (philosophy of gender, perception, social ontology etc.) can opt to write about a topic that advances their research. Please get in touch if you intend to do so.

Class Schedule

Part 1: What is Race?

Week 1

- Introduction
- **Lecture:** An Introduction to Philosophy through the Lens of Race I: The History of the Idea of Race.
- **Lecture:** An Introduction to Philosophy through the Lens of Race II: Race in Continental Philosophy and the Social Turn in Analytic Philosophy.

Week 2

- **Reasoning I:** Validity. Reading: Ney, Alyssa. 2014. *A Logic for Metaphysics*. In *Metaphysics: An Introduction*, 1–28.
- **Reasoning II:** Soundness. Ney continued.
- **Reasoning Test (in-class).**

Week 4

- Hardimon, Michael O. 2003. “The Ordinary Concept of Race.” *The Journal of Philosophy* 100, no. 9: 437–55.
- Mills, Charles. 1998. *But What Are You Really?: The Metaphysics of Race*. In *Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race*, 41–66.
- Haslanger, Sally. 2000. “Gender and Race: (What) Are They? (What) Do We Want Them to Be?” *Noûs* 34, no. 1: 31–55.

Week 3

- Mallon, Ron. 2004. “Passing, Traveling and Reality: Social Constructionism and the Metaphysics of Race.” *Noûs* 38, no. 4: 644–73.
- Haslanger, Sally. 2008. *A Social Constructionist Analysis of Race*. In B. Koenig, S. Lee and S. Richardson (ed.), *Revisiting Race in the Genomic Age*, 56–69.
- Ludwig, David. 2020. “Understanding Race: The Case for Political Constructionism in Public Discourse.” *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 50 (4): 492–504.

Week 4

- **Lecture:** Taking Stock: Is Race a Social Construction? Limits of the Construction Framework, Race Realism, Race Eliminativism, and Nominalism about Race.
- **Midterm**
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2006. “How to Decide If Races Exist.” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 106: 365–382.

Week 5

- Mallon, Ron. 2006. "Race: Normative, Not Metaphysical or Semantic." *Ethics*, 116(3): 525–551.
- Spencer, Quayshawn. 2019. *How to be a Biological Racial Realist*. In *What is Race, Four Philosophical Views*, 73–110.
- Glasgow, Joshua. 2019. *Is Race an Illusion or a (Very) Basic Reality?* In *What is Race, Four Philosophical Views*, 111–149.

Week 6

- Haslanger, Sally. 2019 *Tracing the Sociopolitical Reality of Race*. In *What is Race, Four Philosophical Views*, 4–37.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 1897. "The Conservation of Races." *The American Negro Academy Occasional Papers*, no. 2. 15 pages.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1985. "The Uncompleted Argument: Du Bois and the Illusion of Race." *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1): 21–37.

Essay Topics Distributed

Part 2:

Racial Norms and Ideology

Week 7

- Harris, Kimberly Ann. 2019. "W. E. B. Du Bois's 'Conservation of Races': A Metaphilosophical Text." *Metaphilosophy* 50 (5): 670–687.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1952. *The Fact of Blackness*. In *Black Skin White Masks*, 82–108.
- Fanon, *The Fact of Blackness* continued.

Week 8

- Glasgow, Joshua. 2009. "Racism as Disrespect." *Ethics*. 120: 64–93.
- Hall, Stuart. 1997. *The Work of Representation*. In *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, 13–74.
- Shelby, Tommie. 2003. "Ideology, Racism, and Critical Social Theory." *The Philosophical Forum* 34(2): 153–188.

Essays Due.

Week 9

- Mills, Charles. 2005. "'Ideal Theory' as Ideology." *Hypatia* 20 (3): 165–184.
- Haslanger, Sally. 2017 "Culture and Critique." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume*, xci (i): 149–173.
- Wills, Vanessa. "What Could It Mean to Say, 'Capitalism Causes Sexism and Racism?'" *Philosophical Topics* 46(2): 229–246.

Week 10

- Basu, Rima. 2019. "The Wrongs of Racist Beliefs." *Philosophical Studies* 176: 2497–2515.

- **Lecture:** Taking Stock: Racism without Race? Explanatory Limits of the Notion of Race.
- Frye, Marilyn. 1983. *Oppression*. In *The Politics of Reality*, 1–16.

Essay Topic Distributed

Part 3: Racisms

Week 11

- Fanon, Frantz. 1956. *Racism and Culture*. In *Towards an African Revolution*, 29–44.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1990. *Racisms*. In Goldberg, David. (ed.) *Anatomy of Racism*, 3–17.
- Garcia, Jorge. 1996. “The Heart of Racism.” *Journal of Social Philosophy* 27: 5–45

Week 12

- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 1997. “Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation.” *American Sociological Review* 62(3): 465–480.
- Mills, Charles. 2003. “‘Heart’ Attack: A Critique of Jorge Garcia’s Volitional Conception of Racism.” *The Journal of Ethics*, 7(1): 29–62.
- Dummett, Michael. 2004. *The Nature of Racism*. In *Racism in Mind*, 27–34.

Week 13

- Urquidez, Alberto G. 2018. “What Accounts of ‘Racism’ Do.” *Journal of Value Inquiry* 52 (4): 437–455.
- Blum, Lawrence. 2023. “‘Cultural Racism’: Biology and Culture in Racist Thought.” *Journal of Social Philosophy* 54 (3): 350–369.
- **Concluding Conversation:** Are the Tools Acquired in this Class Fit for (the) Purpose (of Navigating Race and Racism)?

Essays Due.

End of Semester.

3 Teaching Evaluations

3.1 Quantitative Data: Global Assessments COURSES TAUGHT AS PRIMARY INSTRUCTOR

Overall course quality
(1=poor, 2=weak, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)

Course	Semester	N	Course Quality
Kant's Theoretical Philosophy	Spring 2021	10	4.9
Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality: Intersectional Feminist Philosophy	Fall 2020	10	4.8
Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality: Intersectional Feminist Philosophy	Spring 2019	18	4.67

COURSES TAUGHT AS TEACHING ASSISTANT

Overall effectiveness, compared to other instructors you have had
(1=poor, 2=weak, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent)

Course	Semester	N	Teaching Effectiveness
Introduction to Ancient Greek Philosophy	Fall 2017	22	4.54
Introduction to Metaphysics	Spring 2018	21	4.35
Philosophy of Religion	Fall 2018	20	4.25
Philosophy of Gender	Spring 2019	19	4.41
Philosophical Classics	Fall 2019	12	4.27
Decisions, Games, and Social Choice	Spring 2020	35	4.68
Introduction to Bioethics	Fall 2021	31	3.78
Philosophy and Science: An Introduction to Both	Fall 2022	25	4.32

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering
ASEN.2021.Spring

Course: AS.150.308.01.SP21: Kant's Theoretical Philosophy
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 10/10 (100.00 %)

1 - The overall quality of this course is:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%								
Weak		(2)	0	0.00%								
Satisfactory		(3)	0	0.00%								
Good		(4)	1	10.00%								
Excellent		(5)	9	90.00%								
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
10/10 (100.00%)	4.90	0.32	5.00	18353	4.21	0.92	4.00	335	4.29	0.80	4.00	

2 - The instructor's teaching effectiveness is:												
Rima Hussein												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%								
Weak		(2)	0	0.00%								
Satisfactory		(3)	0	0.00%								
Good		(4)	1	10.00%								
Excellent		(5)	9	90.00%								
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
10/10 (100.00%)	4.90	0.32	5.00	21487	4.28	0.95	5.00	329	4.33	0.86	5.00	

3 - The intellectual challenge of this course is:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%								
Weak		(2)	0	0.00%								
Satisfactory		(3)	0	0.00%								
Good		(4)	2	20.00%								
Excellent		(5)	8	80.00%								
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
10/10 (100.00%)	4.80	0.42	5.00	18161	4.28	0.80	4.00	331	4.42	0.72	5.00	

4 - The teaching assistant for this course is:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Poor		(1)	0	0.00%								
Weak		(2)	0	0.00%								
Satisfactory		(3)	0	0.00%								
Good		(4)	0	0.00%								
Excellent		(5)	0	0.00%								
N/A		(0)	10	100.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
10/10 (100.00%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	18091	4.24	0.96	5.00	331	4.44	0.80	5.00	

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering

ASEN.2021.Spring

Course: AS.150.308.01.SP21: Kant's Theoretical Philosophy
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 10/10 (100.00 %)

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:

Response Rate 1/10 (10%)

• N/A

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%											
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%											
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0.00%											
Agree somewhat	(4)	0	0.00%											
Agree strongly	(5)	10	100.00%	█										
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/10 (100.00%)	5.00	0.00	5.00	18096	4.05	1.04	4.00	332	4.35	0.86	5.00			

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Much lighter	(1)	0	0.00%											
Somewhat lighter	(2)	1	10.00%	█										
Typical	(3)	7	70.00%	█										
Somewhat heavier	(4)	2	20.00%	█										
Much heavier	(5)	0	0.00%											
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/10 (100.00%)	3.10	0.57	3.00	18122	3.17	0.92	3.00	331	3.06	0.76	3.00			

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Response Rate 9/10 (90%)

- I gain a deeper and better understanding about Kant's philosophy.
- Honestly, the best aspect of this course is Rima. Her teaching style is incredibly engaging, she welcomes all students, and she wants everyone to succeed. I appreciate how Rima encourages us to ask questions and let her know when we are confused. She doesn't expect us to come in knowing everything. Even though the material is challenging, the class environment is welcoming so that I feel comfortable participating and asking questions. On a more logistical note, the handouts were really helpful for my understanding. The debates were fun as well.
- The instructor is the best! Rima is knowledgeable and funny and passionate about teaching and helping her students do their best.
- The lectures are engaging and the teacher is wonderful. She is friendly, intelligent, and exciting. The readings are interesting as well. The worksheets that were added later in the class were also great.
- Rima is a really deep and loving human being. She helps all of her students and is able to make the course accessible to students who are unfamiliar with philosophy, which is a really difficult thing to do. I'm really glad I have gotten to know Rima throughout the semester. She is very patient when answering our questions, which is very difficult considering the difficulty of the subject material (it's Kant after all!). Every philosophy student should take a class from her.
- The instructor does a good job of making the material fun and engaging with the students.
- Rima's teaching and engaging lectures are the best aspect of the course
- Discussion and working through material, as well as freedom on what to write about
- Rima! Incredible teacher and mentor.

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering

ASEN.2021.Spring

Course: AS.150.308.01.SP21: Kant's Theoretical Philosophy
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 10/10 (100.00 %)

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?

Response Rate 7/10 (70%)

- I overall enjoyed learning from the class!
- This isn't necessarily a bad thing, but personally some of the readings took me a really long time.
- n/a
- Occasionally there is assigned too much dense reading for a singular class.
- Nothing. This is a fantastic class.
- It felt like the class was pretty lost a lot of the time in terms of understanding the content. I don't know if this is just because the material is too complicated or what, but this sometimes decreased the quality of the learning experience.
- The material is dense and tedious to understand

10 - What would most improve this class?

Response Rate 4/10 (40%)

- I like how the course evolved over the semester to be more interactive based on our feedback, and I feel like in the second half of the semester we got in a rhythm that seems to work well for everyone. So in terms of class time itself, I don't have any suggestions. The only thing I can think of is maybe making the assigned reading lengths more consistent because at times we had to read 20 pages for one week and 100 pages for another. The longer readings were still manageable, though.
- n/a
- Spend more time covering the basics of Kant's philosophy. Also maybe making it clear in the course description that this is an upper level course
- Going over the material in class rather than just at home alone

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Response Rate 7/10 (70%)

- The class would deeply explore Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. You would be expected to read selected chapters throughout the semester.
- Background in philosophy is helpful, but not necessary. Because the material is challenging and specific, an interest in philosophy is important at the very least. Prospective students should expect to spend a fair amount of time on readings and be prepared to discuss in class. Feedback on assignments is very helpful, and the grading is more than fair. I would highly recommend this course to anyone, as it is a rewarding experience and has improved my analytic skills immensely.
- Prospective student should know that Kant's theoretical philosophy is confusing yet rewarding.
- Background in philosophy is not required, but it can be useful to have some knowledge of modern philosophical problems
- No prior knowledge of Kant is necessary. Rima is very helpful and kind in helping her students, so if you have difficulty, don't feel shy to bring your questions or the texts you're confused about to her. She actively asks for people to come and ask her questions about the text.
- Grading is fair. Feedback from the instructor is very comprehensive and helpful. You should know some philosophy background I think in order to understand the content
- Kant is hard to understand and it takes a lot of time but Rima is super cool so she makes it fun

Course: AS.363.306.01.FA20: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory

Instructor: Rima Hussein *

Response Rate: 10/14 (71.43 %)

1 - The overall quality of this course is:														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%											
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%											
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%											
Good	(4)	2	20.00%											
Excellent	(5)	8	80.00%											
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	school	department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	school	Mean	STD	Median	department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/14 (71.43%)	4.80	0.42	5.00	16662	4.22	0.91	4.00	18	4.67	0.59	5.00			

2 - The instructor's teaching effectiveness is:														
Rima Hussein														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%											
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%											
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%											
Good	(4)	2	20.00%											
Excellent	(5)	8	80.00%											
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	school	department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	school	Mean	STD	Median	department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/14 (71.43%)	4.80	0.42	5.00	19273	4.29	0.93	5.00	18	4.56	0.70	5.00			

3 - The intellectual challenge of this course is:														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%											
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%											
Satisfactory	(3)	1	10.00%											
Good	(4)	0	0.00%											
Excellent	(5)	9	90.00%											
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	school	department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	school	Mean	STD	Median	department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/14 (71.43%)	4.80	0.63	5.00	16592	4.29	0.80	4.00	18	4.72	0.67	5.00			

4 - The teaching assistant for this course is:														
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Poor	(1)	0	0.00%											
Weak	(2)	0	0.00%											
Satisfactory	(3)	0	0.00%											
Good	(4)	0	0.00%											
Excellent	(5)	0	0.00%											
N/A	(0)	10	100.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	school	department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	school	Mean	STD	Median	department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/14 (71.43%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	16556	4.23	0.97	5.00	18	4.88	0.35	5.00			

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:	
Response Rate	0/14 (0%)

Course: AS.363.306.01.FA20: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 10/14 (71.43%)

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Disagree strongly	(1)	0	0.00%											
Disagree somewhat	(2)	0	0.00%											
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0.00%											
Agree somewhat	(4)	1	10.00%											
Agree strongly	(5)	9	90.00%											
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	school	department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	school	Mean	STD	Median	department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/14 (71.43%)	4.90	0.32	5.00	16593	4.05	1.06	4.00	18	4.78	0.43	5.00			

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means									
Much lighter	(1)	1	10.00%											
Somewhat lighter	(2)	3	30.00%											
Typical	(3)	6	60.00%											
Somewhat heavier	(4)	0	0.00%											
Much heavier	(5)	0	0.00%											
N/A	(0)	0	0.00%											
					0	25	50	100	Question	school	department			
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	school	Mean	STD	Median	department	Mean	STD	Median			
10/14 (71.43%)	2.50	0.71	3.00	16604	3.20	0.94	3.00	18	3.00	0.91	3.00			

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Response Rate	10/14 (71.43%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rima is a passionate human being with a huge heart. She is a fantastic instructor who cares deeply about her students. I've learned about epistemic injustice, the epistemic foundations of intersectional feminism, materialism, compulsory heterosexuality, among others. Her class design is innovative. The traditional class framework is based on handing out paper assignments, assigning grades, and moving on to new assignments without being given an opportunity to improve on previous assignments. Her class is based on improvement. Students are given ample opportunities to improve on a single project of their choosing (related to the class material) for the duration of the semester (e.g. handing in drafts, going to office hours, peer feedback, etc) and the final grade is based on the culmination of those improvements and the quality of the final project. This allows for students to actually become better writers and deeper, more reflective thinkers. Her class is also a safe space. I've participated in some high-intensity class environments which deter me from participating in philosophical discussion. While some professors may unintentionally signal distaste for 'low-level' or un-nuanced thinking and therefore deter beginner philosophy students from pursuing philosophy, Rima is focused on improving all students from their current level. She offers constructive criticism while being kind, open, and welcoming. She also recommends books relevant to each student's project to help them improve in their field of interest. I would recommend any student take a class with Rima, and I will certainly be taking the classes she offers in future semesters. I loved the opportunity for class discussions and the readings we read in class. It was a judgement free zone in which people felt comfortable sharing their experiences and opinions and I loved that. I loved the content and I loved how class went when we would discuss. Rima is great engaging teacher who was so nice, and really wanted everyone to succeed and cared a lot about the course This class have allowed to understand the ideology of the feminism movement. I was able to discover that i have a strong aspect of feminism growing in me. the readings and class discussion were extremely engaging and compelling the professor is really passionate, kind and a pleasure to learn from I wanted to do well in this class, even though I had a lot going on, because I could tell rima cared about me as not only a student but a person as well this class helped me learn so much about myself and now I know im really passionate about understanding these concepts During the first few classes of the semester, the professor asked us how she could improve the class because she felt that we were not engaging in meaningful discussion or connecting as well as she had hoped. The honest conversation that we had as a class was very enlightening and played a huge role in turning around the course. Students were able to better understand the course material and we had much more productive discussions. This just goes to say that the professor was very open and honest and willing to make changes to help improve the class. She understood that we were having a hard time mentally and emotionally and was willing to accommodate us. The professor - just fantastic and great at managing a class while not controlling it (if that makes sense), the content chosen, the profs flexibility, the final paper's freedom - really most everything was great The best aspect of this course are the readings Rima chose for us to read. The layout and organization of the class were logical and flowed nicely. The class discussions are also the best part of this course, as you get to interact with your classmates and dive into different aspects of the reading. You learn just as much from your classmates as you do from the reading, because they will point things out that you did not notice, or provide supporting evidence for a tangential thought you hadn't considered. 	

Course: AS.363.306.01.FA20: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 10/14 (71.43 %)

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?

Response Rate	9/14 (64.29%)
---------------	---------------

- Literally nothing. This is the best course I've taken so far at this university.
- Some of the readings were really long and dense so it was difficult to comprehend and discuss in class.
- It was a little challenging to have such a long class once a week, but I think Rima did a great job with making it as painless as possible.
- N/A
- really long class period, but that's the only thing I can think of
- N/A
- having to be online
- At times, the class discussions veered off-topic from the readings.
- n/a

10 - What would most improve this class?

Response Rate	6/14 (42.86%)
---------------	---------------

- Again, literally nothing. This is the best course I've taken so far at this university.
- Changing some of the readings to be shorter and providing more contextual information so that we understand the more dense readings.
- n/a
- N/A
- if we could meet in person
- There was not much guidance provided on how to write philosophy papers, which would have been helpful when writing the final papers.

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Response Rate	6/14 (42.86%)
---------------	---------------

- This course is very informative and has a great professor who truly wants you to engage and get all that you can out of the readings and discussions.
- The readings are very nice
- reading is manageable and everything you read is extremely interesting
- It would shape your understanding of feminism. You will learn a lot through readings and assignments. The professor, Rima Hussein does an amazing job explaining class materials.
- this is an amazing class- my favorite class this semester rima's discussions are engaging and fascinating and you'll learn so much from them most classes at hopkins make learning stressful and exhausting but rima and this class made learning fun energizing and exciting
- There is no need for any background knowledge in philosophy. The grading is not punitive.

Course: AS.363.306.01.SP19: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 18/20 (90.00 %)

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:	
Response Rate	3/20 (15%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • n/a • N/A 	

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Disagree strongly		(1)	0	0.00%		4.72						
Disagree somewhat		(2)	1	5.56%	█	3.90						
Neither agree nor disagree		(3)	0	0.00%		4.78						
Agree somewhat		(4)	2	11.11%	█							
Agree strongly		(5)	15	83.33%	██████████							
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
18/20 (90.00%)	4.72	0.75	5.00	16987	3.90	1.09	4.00	37	4.78	0.58	5.00	

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Much lighter		(1)	0	0.00%		3.11						
Somewhat lighter		(2)	2	11.11%	█	3.19						
Typical		(3)	12	66.67%	██████████	3.14						
Somewhat heavier		(4)	4	22.22%	█							
Much heavier		(5)	0	0.00%								
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
18/20 (90.00%)	3.11	0.58	3.00	17007	3.19	0.97	3.00	37	3.14	0.54	3.00	

Course: AS.363.306.01.SP19: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory
Instructor: Rima Hussein *
Response Rate: 18/20 (90.00 %)

5 - Please enter the name of the TA you evaluated in question 4:	
Response Rate	3/20 (15%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • n/a • N/A 	

6 - Feedback on my work for this course is useful:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Disagree strongly		(1)	0	0.00%		4.72						
Disagree somewhat		(2)	1	5.56%	█	3.90						
Neither agree nor disagree		(3)	0	0.00%		4.78						
Agree somewhat		(4)	2	11.11%	█							
Agree strongly		(5)	15	83.33%	██████████							
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
18/20 (90.00%)	4.72	0.75	5.00	16987	3.90	1.09	4.00	37	4.78	0.58	5.00	

7 - Compared to other Hopkins courses at this level, the workload for this course is:												
Response Option		Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means						
Much lighter		(1)	0	0.00%		3.11						
Somewhat lighter		(2)	2	11.11%	█	3.19						
Typical		(3)	12	66.67%	██████████	3.14						
Somewhat heavier		(4)	4	22.22%	█							
Much heavier		(5)	0	0.00%								
N/A		(0)	0	0.00%								
					0	25	50	100	Question	School	Department	
Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median	School	Mean	STD	Median	Department	Mean	STD	Median	
18/20 (90.00%)	3.11	0.58	3.00	17007	3.19	0.97	3.00	37	3.14	0.54	3.00	

Course: AS.363.306.01.SP19: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory

Instructor: Rima Hussein *

Response Rate: 18/20 (90.00 %)

8 - What are the best aspects of this course?

Response Rate	16/20 (80%)
----------------------	-------------

- engaging discussion
- The topic is great and Rima is a super solid instructor who deserves better from her department
- incredible discussions and lecturer
- Every day I learned something new. The material was genuinely so interesting to me and the best part was that we weren't being lectured at, but rather would discuss the readings and learn as a group.
- The discussions and the new and interesting ideas.
- The readings for the syllabus were really interesting and really thoughtfully chosen. I really enjoyed the environment of the classroom as I think everyone felt very comfortable speaking and sharing, so it was a good learning environment. I liked having the opportunity to write a research paper on a topic of our own interest for our final paper.
- Rima is fantastic. Actually engage with readings, reasonable work level, just put in a lot of effort for last paper and it will be rewarding
- The professor is incredibly kind, engaging, and passionate about the material. She made the classroom environment feel safe and enriching, and clearly cared about every student's understanding of the material and personal reflections about what we learned. The class was discussion based, which was definitely the most effective method of conducting this kind of class. The material we read was super interesting, and wasn't comprised of the typical set of readings that are standard for a philosophy class. This was by far one of the best classes I have taken at this school.
- This has been the best class I have taken at Hopkins hands down. The professor, Rima, is the best thing to happen to me all 4 years here. Not only is she an excellent professor and teacher, she is easy to talk to and work with. The work is manageable and doable, even for someone like me who is not a humanities major. I recommend this course for everyone!
- Rima is the best!!! I really felt as though she cared for all of us students and was always very kind and approachable. She allowed us to guide discussions ourselves and led us without losing sight of the purpose of the class. I also appreciated the wide variety of topics and material that we covered in this class. It was all around very enjoyable. The classroom environment was very welcoming, and she made all of the students feel valid and heard during class discussions. She was very good at explaining the groundwork for lot of theories we discussed in a way that was understandable for students without background in Feminist or Queer Theory (like myself). The last day of class interview with activist Dean Spade was a great way to end the semester. I feel as though it really hit home many of the points we discussed in class.
- Readings are really interesting and foster in-depth analysis in class. Rima was an engaging instructor and allowed students to discuss and explore a variety of relevant topics, which allowed for more interesting discussions during class periods.
- The engaging professor and interesting readings
- The readings are very interesting
- I absolutely loved this class and everything we covered. My favorite aspect of the course was the combination of expose-rough draft-peer review form, as I found the feedback on each portion incredibly helpful in drafting and redrafting my final paper, particularly because philosophy courses can be extremely challenging at times.
- This course is a fantastic background for feminist societal critiques. It provides a wonderful breadth of material that can be engaged with, as a class and a personal level. The breadth of what we read and studied allowed for a student to settle on views that they strongly disagreed with and which ones were tools to better understand the world they live in. The course often operated as an open discussion, with many classes driven by the students as much as the instructor. This kept an open environment where personal stances could be brought into conversation and respectfully discussed. This was one of the few classes I've taken where I feel I will take the knowledge learned with me beyond Hopkins. I felt I learned in a way that I was able to grow as a person.
- The best aspects of this course were the opportunity to talk about feminist issues in an environment with other people close to these issues and willing to learn about them in an academic context, and the focus on intersectionality as an approach to feminist and LGBT issues. I learned a lot about older texts pertaining to feminist theory and about relationships between race and gender that I had not seen explored, including those relating to my own culture. I think that this course is essential to anyone interested in learning about feminism from a philosophical and academic perspective.

9 - What are the worst aspects of this course?

Response Rate	14/20 (70%)
----------------------	-------------

- we are assumed to know more than we actually do
- I came in thinking it was a standard theory course and kinda got blindsided by the expectation that it was a more hardcore philosophy course halfway through the semester
- n/a
- Some of the readings were dense and hard to digest.
- Sometimes the reading work load is very heavy and it sucks to not be able to finish a reading before class because you feel like you're not getting enough out of it.
- n/a
- The readings weren't always posted to blackboard which was kinda inconvenient.
- Some of the readings are very long and very dense, but once Rima started to outline them the class before they became less daunting.
- At times, expectations about assignments were a bit confusing and too broad.
- Nothing
- Sometimes the assigned readings were really long
- There was no negative aspect to the course at all. However, I did have an issue with one member of the class and felt as though the instructor could have done a better job of handling these situations. On multiple occasions, one member of the class stopped others after class to lecture them on something they mentioned in class. I never really noticed it until it was done to me (this individual stopped me after class to "strongly caution me against" something in my life that she had absolutely no idea about-- she literally told me to reevaluate my life choices regarding a highly personal and sensitive situation. I literally do not know this person in any way besides having had this one class with her). I found it really inappropriate and tried to respond in the most assertive but also least instigating way. Situations like this can (I think) have a negative impact on the classroom environment, which is really sad because I found our classroom environment to be one of the best I've ever experienced at Hopkins. I don't think this really reflects as much on the instructor as it does on this individual (who really had no right to say something like this to me or anyone else in our class), but wanted to mention it.
- There wasn't a section to the course, which normally I think provides a useful time to discuss readings, but the class 'lectures' were so student-driven I don't think this was detrimental.
- Sometimes the majority of the class was focused around class discussion, and I was not confident enough in my ideas to lead in a line of thought.

JHU - Krieger School of Arts & Sciences / Whiting School of Engineering

ASEN.2019.Spring

Course: AS.363.306.01.SP19: Feminist and Queer Theory: Race, Class, Gender, Sexuality-Intersectional Feminist Theory

Instructor: Rima Hussein *

Response Rate: 18/20 (90.00 %)

10 - What would most improve this class?

Response Rate	16/20 (80%)
----------------------	-------------

- more background information/context about the readings
- I think just making it more clear that there is an expectation of some baseline comfort with formal philosophy methods at the start
- already great
- The teacher often would explain concepts with intangible ideas and it would sometimes make it slightly difficult to understand what exactly she wanted us to learn. I also think that allowing the students to share their ideas about the reading, and having less of a lecture during classes would make the class much more engaging and allow students to take more away from the course.
- A different classroom
- Maybe the more the class is taught certain passages from the assigned readings will stand out and those will be assigned rather than a whole few chapters although at some point I guess you just have to suck it up because this is college now and classes require reading.
- The readings being uploaded to Blackboard ahead of time would be helpful, but not a big deal.
- n/a
- Posting readings i guess
- I think it would've been nice to spend longer on certain texts than one class period. While I'm happy for the amount of material we covered, I wonder if there were some pieces that would've benefited from breaking it into two days and having time for more analysis.
- Very little to improve upon. Clearer expectations and structure regarding assignments.
- Nothing
- N/A
- More guest speakers! I really, really enjoyed our session with Dean Spade
- This class used more than just books and essays to analyze theory and I think the chance to create something other than an essay for a project would have been a very interesting way to explore the ideas discussed in this course.
- The above might be improved if we had a starting point for discussion to think about before the lecture, sent out in the syllabus or in the blackboard discussion.

11 - What should prospective students know about this course before enrolling? (You may comment on any aspect of this course such as assumed background, readings, grading systems, and so on.)

Response Rate	13/20 (65%)
----------------------	-------------

- This class relies somewhat heavily on a background knowledge of feminist philosophy and feminist philosophical works.
- The reading can get heavy (both in page number and content) sometimes This is more conjecture but I think (hope) the grading will be fair/lenient
- most of work is in the second semester
- The readings are tough but very rewarding once you understand also Rima is super approachable and can explain literally anything to you.
- Take the class and read what you can and engage with the material. Challenge yourself and your views of the world because it's really important stuff and it shouldn't just be left to certain people to grapple with while everyone else ignores it.
- you will learn a lot in this class and love it while doing so.
- As long as you have an open mind and care about the material you'll enjoy the course!
- There is a lot of dense reading that sometimes makes little sense when you're trying to tackle it by yourself. Do not be discouraged. Also ask for help early with your paper as the freedom can make it difficult to know where to start.
- Some philosophy background is helpful, but not necessary to do well in the class. Readings are interesting but can be fairly lengthy at times.
- Doing the readings is pretty much required in order to do well in the course but they're relatively interesting and easy to manage
- Go into this class with an open mind
- I had almost no exposure to feminist theory before this class, and having a discussion based environment and plenty of readings was an incredible introduction to theory that held ideas I was able to take away as useful tools beyond the classroom.
- Prospective students should already be familiar with the feminist movement, and have the ability to recognize power structures in society related to gender, race, and sexuality. They should be willing to do a large amount of reading each week prior to the lectures.

3.5 Selection of Assessments as a Teaching Assistant

Note on these comments:

The Johns Hopkins University does not provide teaching evaluations through their course data management system. These following comments were volunteered by my students. More sets of comments from my activity as teaching assistant are available upon request.

Fall 2017 Introduction to Ancient Greek Philosophy (full comments)

"Excellent preparation for recitations. Yes [student would recommend this TA to a friend]. Helped me to think more clearly about the material. Work on explaining things a bit better so that all students regardless of major can grasp it fully."

"I liked how well Rima engaged the students in her class, and she helped me grasp the material better. I would personally prefer if the material covered in section was more expansive, but Rima did a good job engaging discussion and collaborative work. Rima was extremely nice and willing to provide help outside of section as well. Her enthusiasm and bright personality made section each week a rewarding experience."

"I liked that she was very easy to talk to. Also, she reached out for contact and went above and beyond to ensure I was capable of effectively writing my last paper. Yes, I would recommend this TA to a friend. She clarified multiple philosophical ideas and gave effective time to my paper even though she's probably super busy. I would like to have an assigned group for the year to talk w/ to expand our horizons before getting into the larger group. This would instantly get rid of any student-student awkwardness and probably have more come out of larger group discussions. Great job overall :)"

"I loved how enthusiastic the TA was in every section and admired her ability to teach the material using analogies and relatable concepts. I would definitely recommend her to a friend. She is easy to talk to and genuinely cares that we learn the material. There were times when she could not always answer our questions, but she always recommended sources to look into or admitted the topic is quite obscure/controversial and yield one clear answer. I like her teaching style overall and would only suggest we went over how to write a philosophy paper more in depth as I struggled with this. Perhaps going over a previous year's paper or specifying key parts of a philosophy paper would help since it contributes greatly to our overall grade."

"I most liked Rima's enthusiasm for philosophy and the great extent to which she takes the subject matter seriously. This meant that in our discussion section, ensured that all questions, even seemingly small ones, about the texts and confusions regarding particularly difficult passages or concepts were addressed. She also maintained an environment that felt extremely collaborative. I would have preferred to have had more time to discuss confusions, as sometimes class felt rushed."

"I really admire Rima's preparedness. You can tell she has really thought about the material and how best to present it to students in order to facilitate learning. Her enthusiasm for the subject has made me excited to be a philosophy major. Additionally, Rima is great at facilitating discussions on small and large scales and really helps you explore your thought process. I always come out of section feeling like I achieved a greater understanding of Plato, Aristotle, or whatever we have read that week."

"I think Rima did a good job in summarizing each week's material. She prepared very well before each section as one can tell from her note on blackboard. I would certainly recommend her if I have friends who are also taking philosophy classes. Before essay submission, she gave me a lot of great advice that could better restructure and add extra, more compelling evidence to my essay. I think overall Rima is a very good TA."

"I would definitely recommend Rima to my friends. She always comes to section prepared, and since she attends lecture, our discussions directly relate to what we are learning there (unlike some other experiences I had at this school). Rima is also very helpful in essay feedback and one-on-one sessions. She gives good constructive criticism and helped me grow as a writer. I have never taken a philosophy lecture and, so I was very unsure on how to approach philosophy essays, and Rima helped guide me and show me different approaches that people take to writing in philosophy. I really appreciate Rima's dedication and insight in this class. She's a great TA!"

"Rima answered every question we had without fail. She was knowledgeable, enthusiastic, and encouraging. She was always willing to delve deeper into the material, and connected it to other interesting subjects she knew. She made use of interesting group techniques and kept us engaged. I have no negative feedback. Rima was great. She would be a great TA for anyone."

"Rima did a great job of changing up the way we learned or discussed the material in section. I have taken a fair amount of philosophy classes here and this is rarely if ever done. We debated the material, discussed it in games, or did other creative stuff instead of her just lecturing at us. Rima was also very helpful in that she was more than willing to look over student's work, drafts, or outlines. She would then also give very detailed helpful feedback. Rima was also a fair grader, I would recommend her to a friend without hesitation. I particularly enjoyed Rima's enthusiasm for philosophy in general, it bled into class and created a cool atmosphere for learning."

"Rima did an excellent job teaching as a TA. She not only directly covered the material from lectures, but also posed new questions in sections, which allowed us to think about and better understand the material. I would certainly recommend her for her performance. I think Rima helped us best as students by her style of posing new questions related to course topics. Instead of just repeating the content, we understood it more broadly, which I think is a helpful skill for any class. That being said, I would prefer to have some more direct tie-ins, but not too much to disrupt the established flow."

"Rima has a passion for philosophy and always pushes her students to really engage with and understand the material beyond simply reading it. Discussions are fast-paced and challenging, but she will always stop and make sure the basic understanding is there for everyone. She was always available to comment on work and give suggestions for assignments, and help me to think through my questions and develop my own arguments rather than answering them outright. Sometimes section activities seemed to reflect the content of the readings more broadly rather than the topics covered in lecture. Sometimes this made section difficult but other times it was helpful review."

"Rima has been a great TA. She is strict on writing philosophy papers and making good arguments, but she is also available to meet in person and give constructive feedback. Overall the sections have been very helpful; it would be even better if we could have the time to cover more materials for the course, or with a more efficient section structure. I really enjoyed working with Rima."

"Rima is an excellent TA to have. She is genuinely enthusiastic about philosophy and is a very encouraging mentor. She works very hard at her job and goes out of the way to be available for any questions and doubts. It's a true privilege to have her as my TA."

"Rima is an excellent TA. She is very knowledgeable about the course material but open to students' ideas and interpretations. She's very approachable, so going to her for help is easy and encouraged. She always has detailed plans for sections to lead discussions. Her one-on-one help has been a highlight of the course for me. I always feel like I understand the material better when I speak with her. I'm not particularly a philosophy-type of person, but Rima made me feel and gave me the tools to better understand philosophy. I would highly recommend Rima as a TA to any friend. I feel much more confident about the material with Rima's guidance. I do not have any recommendations for changes for Rima's teaching."

"Rima is extremely knowledgeable both about the subject and a great number of topics intrinsically related. She attends all lectures and sections with materials prepared. However, sometimes I think she assumes that we, the students, are more aware of the subject that we actually are. So she could possibly benefit from slowing down."

"Rima is remarkably passionate about philosophy. And when passion and intelligence are combined, I think a special learning environment is created. I have had previous experiences w/ philosophy courses, but due in part to Rima's orchestration of our Friday section (met once a week), this one was the most instructive. She is always willing to tackle a student's philosophical quandry head on, never dismissive of the question, even if it might not be phrased quite right – and on the rare occasions she didn't know the answer she'd email the class a scholarly article detailing a response."

"Rima is very knowledgeable and explains the material very well. I also like that our sections aren't just another lecture, but time to discuss and present ideas brought up in class and of our own. Her feedback/critique on our assignments is very useful."

"Rima strives to understand how her section learns and then teaches according to that. It seemed like she genuinely searched for areas of weakness and then targeted them. I would recommend her to a friend primarily because of her helpfulness outside of section. Perhaps she could mention exam/essay writing strategies a bit more throughout the semester to improve, although she did give us an extra opportunity to improve our writing."

"She clearly had rich knowledge of and passion for the material taught in this course. She also always wanted section to be a time for further learning and growth. I would recommend this TA to a friend. She helped me stay on top of the material from week to week. I would recommend this TA changes the pace at which she teaches. Oftentimes, section went through material too quickly for some of us to follow. Thus, her sections would have benefitted from a slower pace/more focus."

"She is very enthusiastic about the material and always willing to explain things in a different way so you understand them. I would definitely recommend her to a friend. She really helped me have a better grasp on how to create a sound argument and what makes an argument good and persuasive. She showed complete competency in ancient Greek philosophy and did a lot to help me understand how the philosophers thought about some of the topics in their writings. She is a very blunt person and is not afraid to tell you exactly what she thinks of your argument which was a little scary at first but I think it really helped me to be very thoughtful before stating an argument."