! This example commentary is for training purposes only. Copying or replicating responses from this example for use on a portfolio violates TPA policies. Portfolios may be screened for originality using software for detecting plagiarism. Candidates submitting a portfolio for scoring must confirm they are the sole author of the commentaries and other writing. Failure to adhere to scoring policies may void scores and cause a report to the institution or state agency associated with the submission.

1. Lessons shown in video

Clip 1 is from Lesson 2, "Acting Tools: Repetition and Point of View." Clip 2 is from Lesson 5, "Repetition and Rehearsal:" Informal Assessment and Practice Support Activity in a gallery setting.

2. Promoting a positive environment

In order to honor student assets and ensure student engagement, I built my lessons on cooperative learning constructs and was careful to strategically group students so they could effectively peer mentor (Clip 3, 1:05-2:59). Strategically grouping students helps me create opportunities for differentiated learning. Partners demonstrate ability to co-construct knowledge in Clip 3: Language Use. In Clip 3, Liam suggests altering the construct (1:58).

Cooperative learning requires teamwork, so it positively impacts the classroom community by helping students strengthen peer relationships and build communication skills. In Clip 2, students engage in a rehearsal (0:00 – 6:00) and gallery showing (6:00 – end of clip.) This construct ensures that all students are engaged in learning and allows me to mentor individual groups.

The most effective way I can build mutual respect and rapport with students is to express genuine faith in their abilities, offer authentic praise, and genuine support (Clip 1: Clip 2: 0:20 – 0:34, Clip 2: 8:01, Clip 2: 8:49, Clip 2: 5:50.) By modeling authentic praise and support, I hope to encourage students to similarly promote and support each other's learning. Students demonstrate this in Clip 2 (0:40 -1:19 and 6:00 - end of clip and throughout Clip 1 (respectful, supportive listening, respectful and insightful feedback.)

In addition, it's crucial to be keenly aware of how my behavior impacts students because negative and positive emotions are equally contagious (Goleman, as cited in Knight, 2013). To promote a friendly, open, and warm atmosphere in the classroom, I work to consistently and genuinely demonstrate warmth and kindness to students. (Clips 1 and 2, throughout; for example, at 3:20 in Clip 1, I compliment students on their "excellent questions.")

Clip 1: Classroom environment: The class begins and usually ends with discussion in a circle (0:00-3:27) This is a cozy way to begin, and I designed this to help us to connect, check in, and then transition to the work of the day. The class transitions smoothly (3:27 – 3:36) to the projector area, where we journal and set daily goals.

Clip 2 (throughout) demonstrates how the theatre is set up for cooperative learning activities. Students rehearse and practice simultaneously while I rove to give feedback.)

Clip 2: (5:32) I use a signal to ensure a smooth transition from one activity to another.

3. Engaging students in learning

Clip 1: At 4:03, I ask students to restate academic vocabulary in the learning targets so they can apply their growing understanding by making connections and recognizing relationships and I can assess their understanding of process.

Clip 1: At 4:11, I hear a student feedback the word "drill" (a potential misconception), so I restate the objective as "shaping, growing, expanding." Students have expressed the same words in reference to rehearsal process; my goal is to help them to see the discipline of rehearsal as an opportunity to grow and explore.

Clip 1: 5:21: Understanding the third learning target is a crucial part of the scaffolding for understanding Repetition, so I ask students to Think/Pair/Share to distinguish between "performing Repetition" and "doing" Repetition. At 5:26, I ask students, "What does that mean to you? Students do think/pair/share.

Clip 1: 6:02: Students share responses

Clip 1: 6:07: I summarize student responses.

In Clip 2, Jonathan and Carl reflect on Learning Targets during rehearsal with feedback (0:40-1:19). (This learning construct is useful because I can confer with pairs as needed.)

Engaging students with knowledge, skill, context

Clip1: 0:00- 3:26: Classroom environment: The class begins with discussion in a circle (this is relaxed, informal, and designed to help us to connect and then transition to the work of the day.)

Clip 1: 0:00- 2:12: Students express themselves by reflecting on the homework, sharing a partner's experience with the whole group, and analyzing the habits of mind that are changed when we break habits. (1:08: "You have to think about it more;" 1:15: "She couldn't get the correct angles;" 1:38: "It gets easier;" 2:02: "You have to slow down and be conscious of what you're doing.")

Clip 1: 2:12- 3:11: I summarize students' observations: "You had to focus more. You had to take more time. It was painful. You had to concentrate on each event to be successful. I connect this to Meisner goals. Meisner was trying to break actors' bad habits of not listening and not being in the moment. (All of the strategies the actors mentioned in their homework reflection will apply!)

Clip 1: 2:35 - 2:58: in order to deepen the students' understanding of the challenges of Meisner Technique, and in order to forecast the day's learning targets, I connect homework to the process of breaking acting technique habits that can occur when actors confront Meisner Repetition. At 3:05 – 3:11, I forecast that we are going to deepen our understanding of the learning targets by making a *comparison* (language function) about breaking habits (contextual understanding).

Clip 1: Think/Pair/Share activities ("Share" portion at 0:00- 2:11; 5:28-6:00; "Think" portion at 9:00-end) kept students engaged in learning.

Clip 1: 7:26: I use students' exit ticket responses to connect previous day's work, exit ticket questions, and homework. I ask students to offer "opinions and thoughts, so far" in their journals.

Clip 2 (0:00- 9:46) demonstrates how Lesson 5 was designed to help students apply skills in context (i.e. to a rehearsal process using scripted text). Students are exploring, expressing, and applying skills to a creative process. At the beginning of this lesson, students inferred how they could apply Repetition to a rehearsal process; in this clip, they test their inferences. Students demonstrate the central focus throughout the clip.

Clip 2 includes one of the reflections from the 15-minute rehearsal with feedback (0:40 -1:20) before we move into a final rehearsal with no feedback if students are functioning well. Carl and Jonathan demonstrate awareness of how the sequence has expanded their artistic skills, and they articulate their process for practicing the central focus.

Link to prior knowledge and assets

Capitalizing on student assets helps students to connect new learning to prior experience (Benson, Leffert & Scales, (1998). The homework review (entrance ticket) at the beginning of Clip 1 (0:00 - 1:52) capitalizes on internal assets like *achievement motivation* (students completed the assignment), *school engagement* (all students actively participate in

conversation) and external assets like *caring* (students demonstrate caring for one another as they share stories about their experience). The students feel *safe* with one another, and share stories freely. I designed the homework to capitalize on these assets so students could connect the concentration, effort, adjustment, patience, evaluation, and tolerance of discomfort they experienced breaking a mundane habit with the similar process of breaking an artistic habit in Meisner work.

Clip 1: 7:26: I use responses to Exit Ticket Questions in instruction. The questions students have about Meisner work are connected to previous academic experience (questions about the role Meisner plays in building a character; questions about action and objective) and personal acting goals, which are similarly connected to prior academic leaning (How can I react without thinking? Do you have any tips for sustaining concentration?")

By linking learning to students' expressed learning goals (examples in Clip 1: 7:01 -7:12; Clip 2, 1:20-1:40), I address relevant issues that involve investigating and constructing a an approach to real-world acting problems (establishing connection and rapport in audition settings.)

4. Deepen student learning

Clip 1: 3:15 – 3:22: I indicate that we will be using responses from student exit tickets to shape the next part of the lesson. In their responses on exit tickets, students connected queries to prior academic knowledge. Their questions focus on how Meisner work fits into previous content knowledge and process notions. (See below)

Clip 1: 6:15: I ask students, "What does that cultivate when you do that?" I am referring to cultivating doing Repetition in front of an audience without a change in awareness or change in performance. Students call out "consistency," "focus," "comfort," "confidence."

I summarize this as "privacy in public" and connect (first) to Stanislavsky and then to actors' goals (i.e. at 7:06, Connor nods when I recognize how Meisner practice connects to his goal of eliminating self-consciousness and awareness of the audience.)

Clip 1: 8:24: I loop back to habit breaking activity at beginning of class

Clip 1: 9:09: Think/Pair/Share: students infer answers to exit ticket questions in journals (think)

In Clip 2, students apply Meisner technique to a rehearsal process (0:00- 9:46.) The outcomes (students apply Meisner to a rehearsal process) demonstrate the artistic skills students have developed and their ability to apply these skills to rehearsal and performance. I support their efforts with genuine praise for work well done (Clip 2: 0:20 - :034, Clip 2 8:01, Clip 2, 8:49, Clip 2: 5:50.)

Models and demonstrations to support understanding

Clip 1: At 4:03, I ask students to restate academic vocabulary in the learning targets so they can apply their growing understanding by making connections and recognizing relationships and I can assess their understanding of process.

Clip 1: At 4:48, I connect the practice of Repetition to public performance

In Clip 2, students model for one another through performance how they will apply their new skills to a rehearsal of scripted text (0:00-9:46).

Clip 2, 1:24-2:16: I connect actor's work to real world examples.

5. Analysis of teaching

One of my biggest challenges in this learning sequence was student absenteeism. For example, I do a modified version of fist-to-five in Clip 2 (6:51 – 6:56). One group of three doesn't respond with a high five. Jordan was absent during two days of the sequence, and Donavan was partnered with Mitchell, who was absent after the first day of the sequence. Timothy worked with Donavan for one day of the sequence; when Jordan returned, they worked as a trio. Donavan switched partners twice (he worked with both Jordan and Timothy.) In addition, by the second day of the sequence, due to Lorenzo's illness, we had an odd number of students.

Because these students were working as a trio, their experience during Lesson 5 was different from other students'. The trio had less time for application of learning because of their grouping robbed their group of sufficient time to practice the learning support activity (one student observed while two practiced Repetition, then gave the working students feedback.) The result of fist-to-five informal assessment at 6:51 – 6:56 suggests to me that I need to (1) find a way to accommodate for absences so that students who are absent can progress through the learning following the same steps as students who are present and (2) I may have erred by asking these students to perform on that day's learning target (Students will apply Repetition to a rehearsal process) instead of accommodating for absence and regrouping by having these students work on the previous day's learning target (Students will reinforce and refine understanding of Level 1 and Level 2 Repetition by exploring objectivity.) In this way, I could have scaffolded instruction for Merrill by allowing for peer tutoring from and reinforcement by Nolan. and Colin. This plan would have provided these students with the same instruction, exploration, scaffolding, and preparation as students who had worked in pairs the previous day. In addition, if I had set

Timothy, Jordan, and Donavan up to work toward achieving the previous day's learning targets, I would have recognized and acknowledged during this portion of Clip 2 that they were right on track with their learning instead of acknowledging their uncertainty. By doing so, I would have been able to reinforce what was working well in their practice (connection and focus) rather than asking the students to make a leap in learning as a cooperative group that was slightly too big a step for their groups' ZPD.

I gave the trio students extra attention and feedback, but my fist-to-five assessment in Clip 2
(5:56) let me know that I need to anticipate these issues and create a plan that will ensure that students who miss class or whose cooperative learning groups are affected by absences don't have gaps in their learning or feel "behind."

Since Timothy, Donavan, and Jordan demonstrated to me that (1) students who miss class will have gaps in learning, and I need to accommodate for that by providing targeted coaching when they return to ameliorate gaps, I realize that (2) I need to create an explicit plan for successful regrouping in the instance of absence so the learning of students in cooperative learning groups are not impacted by a partner's absence.

Clip 2 shows me moving swiftly through our gallery share in Lesson 5. When I teach this
sequence again, I will be sure to tighten Lesson 5 to allow for longer performance segments and more closure discussion and reflection.

Changes for improvement

Cooperative learning "is mediated by the learners rather than directed by the teacher" (Knight, 2013. Students in cooperative learning groups are dependent upon one another for co-construction of knowledge; although "student engagement and learning increase when students clearly understand how well they are doing." Students who are in different stages of understanding are moved along their own ZPD in successful cooperative learning constructs (Knight, 2013), ensuring that constructs work for all students is crucial.

Solving the problem of the impact of absenteeism on student progress and the progress of impacted cooperative learning groups will ensure that students don't accumulate small but significant gaps in learning. Proponents of cooperative learning recommend teachers change groups often enough that all students in the class have the opportunity to work together (DeAvila & Duncan, 1980). Traditionally, however, in the Meisner classroom, actors remain with one partner. Although I think that this leads to optimal growth, given the exigencies (and realities) of interruptions—student absence, drills, cancellations, etc.—had I grouped students according to the DaAvila and Duncan

(1980) model during my lesson sequence, all students would have experienced working in a trio in our odd numbered group, and absences would not have impacted individual students so greatly. Alternatively, in some cooperative learning constructs, teachers have each group member fulfill a distinct role to ensure all students participate in organizing and constructing knowledge. (DeAvila & Duncan, 1980). Assigning roles helps students recognize that all have a role in the larger picture of problem solving. This construct might have facilitated the continued progress of students affected by absent acting partners. I think that both adjustments could potentially help to ameliorate the impact of absenteeism and facilitate "ongoing evaluation and correction which are part of the fabric of a constructive and supportive environment" (Nassir, 2008).

In addition, I would like to incorporate goal mapping so that students can track daily progress. Part of Hattie & Timperley's (2007) feedback model) requires that students track their progress. Although we did exhaustive tracking prior to the lesson sequence, reflected, and had frequent formative assessments, I think the sequence will be even stronger if students map their progress and track it on a daily basis to ensure that they know clearly "(1) What is my goal?) (2)What progress toward my goal have I made thus far? (3) What should I do next to make even more effective progress toward my goal?" Most importantly, this will help me track absent students' self-efficacy and progress so that I can effectively adjust instruction for them when they return to the classroom. By creating a safety net for learning when students are absent, I can keep students "psychologically safe" (Knight, 2013) by mitigating their concerns about missed work with effective adaptations and reinforcement strategies in class.

Asking targeted questions during demonstration is a form of explicit strategy instruction (Caram & Davis, 2005), and I felt that this was successful in the lesson sequence. Explicit strategy instruction is positively correlated with achievement gains (Kistner et al, as cited in Ellis, Denton& Bond). On the other hand, although Pressley & McCormick (2007) stress the importance of self-efficacy in learning, I affirmed through teaching this sequence that self-efficacy reports may not be reliable, as stated in Cohen (1987). Students who reported low self-efficacy (Jonathan and Nolan) thrived in this lesson sequence alongside students with higher self-efficacy ratings. Finding a more targeted way to assess performance skill levels prior to creating cooperative learning groupings will help me to more effectively create differentiated cooperative learning groups.