

**ORU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEFENSE OF LEARNING RUBRIC**

CATEGORY	1 - UNACCEPTABLE	2 - ACCEPTABLE	3 - COMPETENT	4 - EXEMPLARY
Contextual Information	The candidate did not address, or only partially addressed the Contextual Information.	The candidate described all components of the Contextual Information.	The candidate described all components of the Contextual Information and the implications of the contextual information.	The candidate described all components of the Contextual Information, the implications of the contextual information, and described adaptations made to the instructional strategies prior to, and throughout the unit based on the contextual information.
Purpose	The candidate did not address the purpose of the unit.	The candidate listed the goals and objectives for the unit.	The candidate listed the goals and objectives for the unit, and described the rationale for what was taught and why.	The candidate listed the goals and objectives for the unit, and described the rationale for what was taught and why, and linked the goals and objectives to the OK PASS objectives and/or the Common Core Standards.
Pre-Assessment Data	The candidate did not address the pre-assessment data and/or did not present a graphic representation of the pre-assessment results.	The candidate described the pre-assessment tool used, presented a graphic of the results, and disaggregated the results into groups and sub-groups.	The candidate described the pre-assessment tool used, presented a graphic of the results, disaggregated the results into groups and sub-groups, and addressed the implications for the unit based on the results.	The candidate described the pre-assessment tool used, presented a graphic of the results, disaggregated the results into groups and sub-groups, addresses implications for unit based on the results, described specific adaptations based on pre-assessment results linking all of them to specific individual students or sub-group or adequately defends their choice to not make adaptations.
Post-Assessment Data	The candidate did not address the post-assessment data and/or did not present a graphic representation of the pre-assessment results.	The candidate described the post-assessment tool used, presented a graphic of the results, and disaggregated the results into groups and sub-groups.	The candidate described the post-assessment data analysis, presented a graphic of the results, disaggregated the results into groups and sub-groups, and addressed the alignment to the objectives	The candidate provided evidence of appropriate conclusions based on the analysis of student learning, presented graphic results, and described multiple hypotheses for why some students or sub-groups did not overcome barriers to achieve learning results.
Reflections on Teaching and Learning	The candidate did not address the reflections on teaching and learning.	The candidate identified at least one of the objectives listed in Level 4.	The candidate identified two of the three objectives listed in Level 4.	<p>The candidate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identified teaching strategies needing strengthening. 2. Described what effect his or her disposition, decisions, practices, or actions had on the learning community, from a Christian Worldview, and includes implications for self change. 3. Presented at least one professional development <i>goal</i> that clearly emerged from the insights and experiences.

ORU College of Education
 Defense of Learning Scores
 School Administrator or Representative Response
SENIOR DEFENSE OF LEARNING 2013

Feedback indicates that 100 percent of the 27 administrators rated the College of Education at the Competent or Exemplary level on each of the categories assessed. The area of **Purpose** - The candidate listed the goals and objectives for the unit, and described the rationale for what was taught and why, and linked the goals and objectives to the OK PASS objectives and/or the Common Core Standards – was more evenly divided between the Competent and Exemplary levels. There may be a need to discuss this component of the presentation further with the candidates.

N = 27				
Category	Unacceptable 1	Acceptable 2	Competent 3	Exemplary 4
Contextual Information	0%	0%	38%	62%
Purpose	0%	0%	43%	57%
Pre-Assessment Data	0%	0%	14%	86%
Post-Assessment Data	0%	0%	29%	71%
Reflections on Teaching and Learning	0%	0%	24%	76%