

Call for Proposals
College Reading & Learning Association
2015 Annual CRLA Conference
Pinnacles of Learning: The Power of Innovation
Portland, OR
November 5-8, 2015



The 48th Annual College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) Conference will be held at the DoubleTree by Hilton in Portland, Oregon (Thursday, November 5—Sunday, November 8, 2015). The conference rates for the hotel are \$150.00 per day (single or double) with complimentary wireless high speed internet in all guest rooms. The DoubleTree is newly renovated and is now one of the first sustainable hotels in the Portland area.

The 2015 CRLA conference theme— *Pinnacles of Learning: The Power of Innovation* — is guided by Mt. Hood, towering in the background of the Portland skyline. Portland is a city of innovation; whether it is technology, public transportation, or a vibrant food culture, everyone is bound to have a memorable experience. The conference will provide outstanding sessions on tried and true learning pedagogy as well as providing information on innovative practices.

The CRLA mission is to provide college reading and learning professionals with an open forum to discover and exchange the leading tools and techniques to enhance student academic success. Included in the Guiding Principles are the following:

- Provide professional development for college professionals active in reading, learning assistance, writing, learning strategies, mathematics, college success programs, mentoring, and tutoring programs;
- Support best practices that promote innovative learning environments;
- Promote a culturally responsive approach to teaching and learning;
- Promote research, evaluation, and assessment in the field.

The conference provides one of the forums with which to provide development, support best practices in innovation and promote the exchange of ideas.

The conference keynote speakers are Kyle Bowen and Linda Nilson. Kyle Bowen is Director of Education Technology Services at Penn State University, where he leads a group focused on creating and cultivating innovative uses of technology for teaching and learning. Formerly the Director of Informatics at Purdue University, he led Purdue's Studio Projects Initiative - overseeing the development of a comprehensive suite of learning tools that seek to address academic challenges experienced by faculty and students, inside and outside the classroom. A relentless pursuer of technologies that hack the classroom, Mr. Bowen is also a regular speaker on educational technology - publishing presentation art that editorializes the latest educational technology trends at classhack.com. In addition to his administrative responsibilities, Mr. Bowen has taught undergraduate courses on public speaking and science writing in Purdue's Brian Lamb School of Communication. He has co-authored and edited more than 20 books on web design, development, and usability and recently co-founded Skyepack, a startup company that provides learning technologies that engage students and reduce course material costs. Mr. Bowen has a broad range of experience with learning technology, and his work has appeared in the New York Times, USA Today, TIME, and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Linda Nilson is founding director of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI) at Clemson University and author of *Teaching at Its Best: A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors*, now in its third edition (Jossey-Bass, 2010; fourth edition under contract), *The Graphic Syllabus and the Outcomes Map: Communicating Your Course* (Jossey-Bass, 2007), *Creating Self-Regulated Learners: Strategies to Strengthen Students' Self-Awareness and Learning Skills* (Stylus, 2013), and *Specifications Grading: Restoring Rigor, Motivating Students, and Saving Faculty Time* (Stylus, 2015). She also co-edited *Enhancing Learning with Laptops in the Classroom* (Jossey-Bass, 2005) and Volumes 25 through 28 of *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development* (Anker, 2007, 2008; Jossey-Bass, 2009, 2010). *To Improve the Academy* is the major publication of the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education. Dr. Nilson's career as a full-time faculty development director spans over 25 years. In this time, she has published many articles and book chapters and has given well over 500 keynotes, webinars, and live workshops at conferences, colleges, and universities both nationally and internationally. She has spoken on dozens of topics related to course design, best teaching practices, assessment, scholarly productivity, and academic career matters.

Presenters are encouraged to align proposed topics with our theme of learning and innovation. The Call for Proposals includes the following sections:

- Session Types
- Important Reminders
- Call for Reviewers
- Important Dates
- Appendix A: Strands
- Appendix B: Guidelines for Submissions (Online Submission Instructions)
- Appendix C: Scoring Rubric

SESSION TYPES

Pre-Conference Institute (3-Hour/Half-Day Workshop or 6-Hour/All-Day Workshop)

Delivered before the conference opens, this session type is an opportunity to present an in-depth workshop requiring a longer time span. Pre-Conference Institutes typically focus on professional development, certification programs, technology competencies, innovative curriculum and instruction, etc. Generally multiple presenters design workshop content to be presented in an integrative mode during the allotted time period (half-day or all-day workshops). Pre-Conference Institutes should be highly interactive. There is a limited number of these sessions.

60-Minute Concurrent Session

A 60-Minute Concurrent Session includes **Research Reports** and **Best Practice Presentations** that promote CRLA's guiding principles and emphasize transformative concepts and practices. This type of presentation should be more than a simple summary of your class, program, or learning center. This session is most successful when presenters demonstrate their research and inquiry process and findings. The topic is presented for approximately 40 minutes with the final 20 minutes reserved for discussion and audience interaction.

- **Research Report**— provides background, rationale, questions, methodology, results, and implications of a completed but as of yet unpublished study. These are very important to the field and are highly encouraged.
- **Best Practice Presentation**— may include research syntheses, position papers on critical issues related to research, or models of learning assistance programming, innovative curricula, or research-driven instruction and instructional support.

90-Minute Concurrent Session

A 90-Minute Concurrent Session includes **Panels** and **Workshops**. Presenters are allotted additional time due to the depth and/or the breadth of the overall topic of the session. These should not be extended presentations or reports but should instead focus on either collaborations (panels) or interaction among participants (workshops). Please address this requirement in your proposal.

- **Panels**— focus on significant issues. They have a strong, unifying theme and usually include ample opportunity for audience participation. A panel typically consists of a chair and three speakers, each presenting for approximately 20 minutes, with the final 30 minutes set aside for audience interaction and discussion. The proposal must list the chair and all speakers, as well as each speaker's individual talking points.
- **Workshops**— demonstrate a practical solution for curricular, instructional, research, evaluation, or assessment problems (among others) that may be encountered by CRLA professionals. The content of the workshop should lead attendees to develop new knowledge, which may later be applied in total or in part at their respective institutions. A workshop should be interactive; the delivery of the content should require a full 90

minutes.

60-Minute Roundtable

A Roundtable is a 30-minute presentation followed by a small group (round table) discussion for the remaining 30 minutes. *There are various Roundtables occurring in the same room with groups consisting of 8—10 participants.* Typically a roundtable topic describes an on-going study that has made sufficient progress to be discussed, or describes innovative programming, curricular design, or instructional practice in the developing or implementing stages. This session type allows for small groups to engage in a focused and guided discussion of an issue facing the profession. Roundtables are a great opportunity for individuals who are new to the conference to become involved in a very friendly venue, or for those who serve a more narrow population to gather like-minded professionals.

IMPORTANT REMINDERS

The following are important reminders for those submitting a conference proposal:

- Proposals must be submitted for review using our online submission system. Access the proposal submission site (available on February 2, 2015) from the CRLA conference website at <http://www.crla.net>.
- Proposals must be submitted no later than 11:59 p.m. (CST) on Wednesday, April 1, 2015.
- To be considered for review, proposals must conform to the Guidelines for Submission. **Incomplete proposals will not be reviewed.** After successfully submitting a proposal, you will receive a confirmation e-mail, as well as instructions on how to access the online system should you need to review or edit your proposal before the submission deadline.
- Presenters must register and pay for the conference. If presenters have not registered by the end of the registration period, their names will be removed from the program. If an individual is the sole presenter, the entire session will be removed from the program.
- The proposal summary has a 1,000-word limit and should follow the Proposal Submission Format. **Remove all personal information to ensure a double-blind review.** Include a reference list that will not count as part of the 1,000-word maximum. Refer to the Scoring Rubric (Appendix C) for more information on proposal criteria.
- If a summary exceeds the length limit, does not conform to the suggested format, or contains identifying information it will be refused without review.
- A proposal may be submitted once and to one strand only. Presenters are expected to explain their strand selection, providing the rationale for their strand choice as well as the anticipated audience. Information regarding your strand selection is critical to the review process. Do not assume your topic and strand are synonymous or that reviewers will instinctively see the connection. Additionally, should your proposal be accepted, your

choice of strand will determine your presentation's placement in the program.

- No individual can appear on the program more than three times as a presenter. CRLA wants to ensure everyone with research to present, a story to tell, or an idea of exceptional value can participate in the annual conference.
- CRLA will provide LCD projectors/screens for all sessions. ***Presenters must provide their own laptops and other necessary equipment.*** A presenter who brings a Mac laptop should also bring appropriate cables to connect the Mac to the projector.
- If your proposal is accepted, please remain true to the original proposal's intent and content. Your abstract will be published in the program as a way to market your session.
- Presenters are strongly encouraged to submit appropriate papers for possible publication in the *Journal of College Reading and Learning*. More information on publication will be available at the JCRL booth in the Exhibit Hall during the conference.

CALL FOR REVIEWERS

CRLA also has opportunities for members to serve the organization by volunteering as a reviewer of proposals. To be considered as a Reviewer, you must complete and submit the online form at <http://www.crla.net/reviewerinterest.taf> by March 20, 2015. If you have any questions regarding the call for Reviewers, contact Dorothy Briggs at dabriggs@email.arizona.edu.

IMPORTANT DATES

- February 2, 2015 Call for Proposals is disseminated and online system is open for proposal submissions.
- March 20, 2015 Deadline for proposal reviewer application
- April 1, 2015 Deadline for 2015 CRLA conference proposals. Proposals must be submitted electronically by 11:59 p.m. (CST).
- June 1, 2015 Notification of proposal review decisions will be distributed via email **to the person who submitted the proposal**. The person submitting is responsible for notifying other individuals listed as presenters.
- July 1, 2015 Conference registration begins.
- August 3, 2015 ***All presenters must be registered for the conference.***

APPENDIX A — STRANDS

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM STRANDS—

- Strand 1: Brain Compatible Teaching/Learning
- Strand 2: College Reading
- Strand 3: College Writing
- Strand 4: Graduate & Professional Student Success
- Strand 5: Learning & Study Strategies
- Strand 6: Learning Assistance Center Management
- Strand 7: Learning with Disabilities
- Strand 8: Mathematics
- Strand 9: Multicultural Issues
- Strand 10: Peer Assistance Programs
- Strand 11: Research and Evaluation
- Strand 12: Technology & Distance Learning
- Strand 13: Student Athletes
- Strand 14: Professional Development and Other Topics*
- Strand 15: Exhibits†

* Strands not associated with a SIG.

† Reserved for Exhibitors only.

Review the strand descriptions below. Select the strand most appropriate for your presentation. Within your proposal summary, name the strand and provide details as to how your presentation aligns with this strand's preferred topics or purpose. Do not assume the reviewers will see the connection between your proposal topic and strand selection. If your proposal is accepted, this information will help with placement in the program, and help conference attendees choose the presentations of most interest to them. With the exception of a few noted strands, all of the program areas and topics are connected to a Special Interest Group (SIG). For questions about topic relevancy, contact the appropriate SIG Leader. More information regarding SIGs can be found on the CRLA website (<http://www.crla.net/index.php/membership/sig>).

The following is a description of program areas and topics by strand:

STRAND 1: Brain Compatible Teaching/Learning

To encourage research in critical thinking and instruction, cognitive processes, adult literacy, problem solving, and cognitive models describing how adults learn and remember.

SIG Chair: Charis Sawyer (csawyer@jccc.edu)

STRAND 2: College Reading

To provide opportunities for sharing ideas, information, theory, and research on teaching reading at the college level.

SIG Chair: Shari Clevenger (clevengs@nsuok.edu)

STRAND 3: College Writing

To promote a more global understanding of the issues in college writing and the advancement of more dynamic strategies for addressing student challenges. This strand also provides an opportunity to discuss pressing concerns in the field and to examine the multicultural nature of writing in graduate programs in rhetoric and composition.

SIG Chair: Kendra Haggard (haggardk@nsuok.edu)

STRAND 4: Graduate & Professional Student Success

To research the learning barriers that graduate and professional students face and to assist the CRLA members who work with these students in delivering the highest quality of services.

SIG Chair: Open Position (conferencechair@crla.net)

STRAND 5: Learning & Study Strategies

To create and foster opportunities for networking, professional growth, and sharing of materials, theory, research, and practice related to college-level learning and study strategies.

SIG Co-Chairs: Teresa Carrillo (tcarrill@jjc.edu); Cassandra Hirdes-Tomlinson (chirdes@email.arizona.edu)

STRAND 6: Learning Assistance Center Management

To provide a forum for the exploration of programming, goals and objectives, promising practices, supervision, and evaluation among learning assistance center managers and staff.

SIG Chair: Jon Mladic (jon.mladic@rasmussen.edu)

STRAND 7: Learning with Disabilities

To explore information, examine ideas, and develop techniques to assist students with learning disabilities. This strand also provides an opportunity to share information on policies and procedures created in accordance with the ADA law, as well as best practices used in accommodating learning-disabled students.

SIG Co-Chairs: Kira Shank (kshank@kaplan.edu); Sheryl Bone (sbone@kaplan.edu)

STRAND 8: Mathematics

To provide an opportunity for research and inquiry among those providing mathematics tutorial services, supervising math labs, and teaching developmental math courses.

SIG Chair: Marco Ortiz (mortiz10@email.arizona.edu)

STRAND 9: Multicultural Issues

To explore topics related to multicultural issues and diversity and how these concerns influence student persistence. This strand also provides an opportunity to share practical experience and critical research on matters related to multiculturalism, broadly defined as race or racial identity, gender or gender identity, international student concerns, trauma culture, underprepared students, and affirmative action programs/services.

SIG Chair: Chyna Miller (chyna.miller@unlv.edu)

STRAND 10: Peer Assistance Programs

To share innovative materials, research, and best practices related to effective peer assistance programs—primarily tutoring and mentoring, but including other successful models (Peer Assisted

Learning, Supplemental Instruction, or Peer-Led Team Learning)—in order to improve recruitment, training, and education; explore different types of programs; assist in program design and assessment; inform about cutting-edge research; and increase faculty involvement.

SIG Co-Chairs: Diane Eisenberg (deisen@chapman.edu); Stephanie Blakely (Stephanie.blakely@tccd.edu)

STRAND 11: Research and Evaluation

To encourage CRLA members to conduct research, to aid in the development of a research base in learning assistance and developmental education, and to disseminate information on current research and evaluation issues.

SIG Chair: Jodi Lampi (jlampi@niu.edu)

STRAND 12: Technology & Distance Learning

To research and explore new methods, techniques, and best practices focusing on the use of technology and distance learning. This strand encompasses a wide range of topics, such as distance learning courses, hybrid classes, tutoring online, effective uses of technology in teaching, and learning center websites.

SIG Co-Chairs: Dorothy Chase (dorothy.chase@csn.edu); Roseann Torsiello (rtt@berkeleycollege.edu)

STRAND 13: Student Athletes

To develop a communication network of researchers and academic support professionals focused on the unique challenges of working with student-athletes. Topics include compliance and eligibility issues, student advocacy and accountability, tutoring, literacy, and career and life skills within the context of college reading and learning.

SIG Co-Chairs: Dorothy Kemp (dkemp2@lsu.edu); Pamela Segal (psegal@towson.edu)

STRAND 14: Professional Development & Other Topics

To encourage the exploration of training and development opportunities for professionals in fields relevant to CRLA. This strand may be used for presentations that do not easily fit into other areas such as history of the field or collaborative ventures.

Strand Chair: Suzanne McCarthy (mccarthys@centenarycollege.edu)

STRAND 15: Exhibitors

This category is reserved for exhibitors who wish to offer a detailed presentation and/or demonstration of their product.

Strand Chair: Melissa Thomas, CRLA Exhibits Chair (thomasmm1@cofc.edu)

APPENDIX B— GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION (Online Submission Instructions)

All proposals must be submitted electronically using CRLA's online submission system, which requires you to input specific information before attaching your summary as a separate document. Before you begin the proposal submission process, you should have all your materials prepared and ready for submission. The following is a list of what you will be asked to include for your proposal submission:

- Session Title—limited to 10 words or less
- Abstract — 50-word limit (to be used in the program, if accepted)
- Strand — rationale regarding strand choice (should be included in the summary as well)
- Session Type — Pre-Conference Institute (3-Hr or 6-Hr), 60-Minute Concurrent (Research Report or Presentation), 90-Minute Concurrent (Panel or Workshop), or Roundtable
- Password — for later use to edit your proposal submission, if needed
- Summary — maximum of 1,000 words and ready for a double-blind review (no author or institution names, or any other identifying information that could undermine impartiality)
- Reference List — include with summary, not as a separate document
- Contact Information — include name, mailing address, phone number, and email address for each participant, and the summer address of the contact person for your proposal

Session Summary

In no more than 1,000 words, compose a complete summary of your proposed presentation. Prepare your proposal summary in a separate document file using Microsoft Word. The content of the summary should be research-based with citations in APA format and ready for a double-blind review. ***No author-identifying information or institutional information*** should appear in the summary.

To indicate a research base for the submission, a current and substantive reference list (not included in the 1,000-word limit) is a necessary component of the proposal summary. Other attachments or appendices should not be included in the summary. If an author cites his/her own work in the reference list, please use APA style (e.g., Author, 1999) to ensure a blind review.

If a summary exceeds the length limit or cannot be reviewed fairly because inappropriate information is included (as described above), the proposal will be refused. If your proposal is returned for any reason, you may rework and resubmit, provided the proposal is resubmitted before the April 1, 2015 deadline.

The summary must include information pertinent to the type of proposal being submitted. Refer to the Summary Proposal Submission Format (next page) for detailed information.

Appendix B—Guidelines for Submissions (Cont'd.)

SUMMARY PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMAT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Purpose• Choice of Strand Explanation• Educational or Scientific Importance of the Study• Perspectives(s) or Theoretical Framework• Methods and/or Techniques	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data source(s)• Delivery Style or Methods• Audience Interest or Conference Theme Connection• Learning Objectives for Participants• Results and/or Conclusions of the Study

You are encouraged to review the Scoring Rubric (Appendix C), which Reviewers use to consider proposals for acceptance. The Rubric does not represent the format in which proposals should be submitted; it is included as an aid to developing your proposal. Submissions should follow the format above. Use the Rubric to gauge the strength of your submission.

Online Submission Process and Confirmation

When you are ready to submit your proposal, go to the online submission system at the CRLA website <http://www.crla.net/conferencesubmission.taf>. You will be asked to input preliminary information about your presentation proposal. Answer the questions, and then attach your session summary (with reference list) as a separate Word file. **PLEASE NOTE: *If at any time during the submission process you feel you have made a mistake, do not hit the “back” button in your browser. At the end of the submission process, you will have the opportunity to edit your submission before you finalize it.***

You will need to assign a password to your proposal. This action will allow you to make changes to your submission, if needed. The address for the proposal editing system will be in a confirmation email, which you will receive after completing your submission, along with other pertinent information such as the proposal ID number and your password. Your proposal submission is not complete until you have received a confirmation email. If you do not receive a confirmation email, contact CRLA Headquarters (c.lemek@crla.net).

If you have any questions or problems with the submission process, you may direct your inquiries to Cindy Lemek at CRLA Headquarters. Contact Cindy between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. (CST) by phone at (414) 908-4961 x103, or via email at: c.lemek@crla.net.

APPENDIX C — SCORING RUBIC

Presentation Title: _____

Strand Choice: _____

Session Type (choose one): _____ Roundtable Discussion _____ 60-Minute Session _____ 90-Minute Workshop/Panel _____ 3-Hr Institute _____ 6-Hr Institute

<i>Criteria (possible points)</i>	<i>Exceeds Criteria</i>	<i>Meets Criteria</i>	<i>Does Not Meet Criteria</i>	Pts.
Relevance to Conference Theme and Strand (10 points)	Relevance of title and description to the proposed strand and conference theme, as well as the presentation as a whole, is explicit (8—10 pts).	Relevance of title and description to the proposed strand and conference theme, as well as the presentation as a whole, is somewhat clear (4—7 pts).	Relevance of title and description to the proposed strand and conference theme, as well as the presentation as a whole, is not clear (0—3 pts).	
Relevance to Field (20 points)	It is obvious this presentation will make a significant contribution to the field. It is based explicitly on sound theory and research (14—20 pts).	This presentation may make a contribution to the field. It has less than a strong, explicit foundation of theory and research (8—13 pts).	It is not obvious this presentation will make a contribution to the field. It rests on neither a sound nor explicit foundation of theory and research (0—7 pts).	
Proposal Format (20 points)	The proposal clearly establishes the content and method of presentation. It is coherently written. A robust reference list of current research is included (14—20 pts).	The proposal does not clearly establish the content and method of presentation OR it is not coherently written. References are dated or incomplete (8—13 pts).	The proposal does not clearly establish the content and method of presentation AND it is not coherently written. No references are included (0—7 pts).	
Learning Objectives for Participants (15 points)	Learning objectives for participants are explicit, appropriate, and reasonable (10—15 pts).	Learning objectives for participants are somewhat appropriate, explicit, and reasonable (5—9 pts).	Learning objectives for participants are inappropriate, unclear, or unreasonable (0—4 pts).	
Presenter's Knowledge & Experience (10 points)	Presenter's knowledge and experience about this topic is obvious and extensive (8—10 pts).	Presenter's knowledge and experience about this topic seems unclear or limited (4—7 pts).	Presenter's knowledge and experience about this topic is not apparent (0—3 pts).	
Delivery (10 points)	Delivery method for session type and audience is clear, appropriate, and effective (8—10 pts).	Delivery method for session type and audience seems unclear, inappropriate, OR ineffective (4—7 pts).	Delivery method for session type and audience seems unclear, inappropriate, AND ineffective (0—3 pts).	
Interest (15 points)	Session sounds interesting, informative, AND helpful (10—15 pts).	Session sounds interesting, informative, OR helpful—2 out of 3 (5—9 pts).	Session seems uninteresting, uninformative, OR unhelpful—any or all (0—4 pts).	
Comments:			Total Points:	