Group A: Structured Role Play

| | Structured Role Play |
|---|---|
| V | at is being simulated: Actor, how actor is directed |
| | Predicatable problem of teaching |
| | Format/one on one informal assessment |
| | Both assessment of student understanding AND |
| А | ordances: |
| | Ask open ended questions is a better |
| | Does let you figure out how candidates are approaching student thinking |
| | standardize actor/practice, using just one standardized student |
| L | itations: |
| | Coaching opportunity??? Limited to assessment |
| | Who decided this is what a standardized student is/looks like |
| | (E.g. multi-lingual learners) |
| | Language of teacher candidate might confuse as well as guide kids |
| | Tension between standardized and how far it can take us |
| V | at else for deeper learning: |
| | Focus on practice/feedback rather than assessment (SPED) |
| | Is there a good reason to follow up with assessment once they have had rehearsal time?). How can it be used |
| а | an assessment tool? Can it help to guide an instructors considerations of what to teach next? |

Group B: Live Actor

What is being simulated: way beyond science content; looking also at relational capital between teacher candidate and student; a lot about assumptions and bias and pedagogical content knowledge

Affordances: gives TCs a chance to practice quick decisions on their feet; slows the moment so TCs can think very deeply about their in-the-moment decisions; would help TCs see culture/identity can be so many things

Limitations: ?? scaling up

What else for deeper learning: teacher candidate gets to go back and reflect on (get a mulligan) for their response

Group C: Avatar-Based

Decisions to be made: What is the learning outcome? Is it well-suited to what the avatars can do?

What is being simulated: How an issue presents itself in the classroom, what requires a response, ow kids would respond to teacher actions/words, what's considered common/usual or "intensity" of behaviors, the work of developing relationships w/kids and working towards cooperation, who and how kids are

Affordances: Can talk to whole group or individual students, can "build" in the class (set norms/rules, then hold students to them/reinforce them), can practice (and vary how much we're trying to practice)

Limitations: Don't necessarily have a lot of broader context of the classroom/school/community, interactions are a little bit stilted/not totally natural, kids can end up being a "type," one interactor for multiple kids + who is representing whom

What else for deeper learning: Debrief, conversations about who and how is being represented, how do folks from w/in the community feel about this and/or the teacher candidates themselves, mix of modalities so avatars aren't speaking in flat/monolithic ways, opportunities for students to learn from each other