I tell my students to think of my class like a woodshop class, where they learn by doing. I build each day around structured questions about the material that I have students discuss in small groups. I often briefly introduce some new material, and then stop to ask the room a question, telling them how long they'll have to come up with an answer. Then I keep randomly selecting names to answer, until I have a broad enough range of answers to illustrate both the correct answer and some important misunderstandings. I do tell them that any member of the group can answer my question, to create a lower-stakes environment for students who feel uncomfortable talking in public. As the classes have gone on, though, I've found that the person I call on almost always answers. It helps that each person had time to think of their own answer, I think, and it helps that they've come to see answering the questions as a routine part of the class. These questions help the students practice philosophical thinking from the first day of the class.

I also design the papers for the class to get students learning by doing. My first four class meetings focus on topics where I expect students to start with strong opinions – say, Boxill on reparations, Boonin on racial profiling, and Thomson and Marquis on abortion. Their first assignment is to write a response to one of those arguments, due about a month after we finish going through the arguments. I give the students highly structured prompts, included in my teaching portfolio. The rest of the writing assignments focus on revising the initial submission: the second assignment is to write peer comments for another student in the class, and the final assignment is to submit a paper revised in light of the feedback from me and the peer.

Requiring several revisions of the paper produces qualitatively better papers. I've also assigned the same paper prompts without requiring students to revise several versions of the same paper. A common problem is that students then defend highly abstract principles without considering their concrete implications. For instance, some responses to Thomson argue that we all have a duty to prevent someone from dying *whenever* we can. Those responses often cherry-pick judgments that fit that duty, without considering just how demanding the duty would be. I've started thinking that students need to see the philosophical problems that are tailor-made for their own work before they can fully latch on to the kind of thinking I aim to cultivate. Writing peer comments helps a surprising amount, too. I frame the peer comments as helping their peer write a better paper. But students often figure out what they should do in their own paper by explaining to their peer why the peer didn't quite do what the assignment asked.

I also require each student to meet with me individually to talk through problems with their paper .(I also give written feedback.) The live meetings allow me to tailor the feedback more closely than I otherwise could. For one thing, the students can ask questions about the feedback as we're going through it; for another, I can sometimes see when they're confused even if they don't ask, and give other examples to illustrate the problems. Providing live feedback makes the single biggest difference in the quality of revisions – the semester when I required revisions without providing live feedback produced notably worse papers.

I also design my class to facilitate learning transfer. I put the more abstract material later in the semester – in political philosophy, for instance, going over work from Rawls, Okin, and Mills once the students have already written their first paper. I require students to incorporate something from the more abstract portion of the class in their final submission. For instance, some students end up suggesting that the fundamental wrong in racial profiling consists in an *expressive harm*; others end up suggesting that it undermines the social bases of self-respect, treating some people as subpersons. I don't highlight these sorts of applications as we work through the more abstract material; my goal is instead for students to come up with the applications themselves. Students then end up with sophisticated understanding of whatever abstract concept they incorporate into their paper, which they end up drawing on in later discussions. Discussions late in the semester then end up making illuminating connections to a wide range of earlier material, because different students have internalized different parts of the earlier material. I also design the structured in-class questions to facilitate learning transfer, designing the questions to build on earlier material. In political philosophy, for instance, I start the semester by talking about reparations, and some student or other always insists that reparations will never happen. When we get to Mills, I ask the students to articulate the descriptive social contract that captures that student's confidence that reparations will never happen – and the students normally use previous material from the course as they try to answer.