



**Call for Proposals**  
**College Reading & Learning Association**  
**2017 Annual CRLA Conference**  
***Celebrating 50 Years of Building Bridges***  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
November 1-4, 2017

The 50<sup>th</sup> Annual College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) Conference will be held at the Westin Convention Center in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Wednesday, November 1—Saturday, November 4, 2017). 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 2017 CRLA conference theme— *Celebrating 50 Years of Building Bridges* — makes reference to Pittsburgh’s famous bridges which are the integral part of the city’s skyline. For a half-century, we, a community of reading and learning researchers and practitioners, have been building bridges across a plethora of frontiers to enhance student academic success. In our everyday work, we cross geographic, cultural, and socio-economic borders; merge disciplinary and technological boundaries; overcome age and language differences; and narrow gaps in high school, college, and career transitions. Join our festive celebration of CRLA’s 50<sup>th</sup> jubilee in Pittsburgh, a city of bridges!

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’s mission is to provide a forum for professional development, support best practices in innovation, and promote the exchange of ideas.

Presenters are encouraged to align proposed topics with this year's theme of *Celebrating 50 Years of Building Bridges*. 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 1, 2017) from the CRLA conference website at [www.crla.net/conference/2017](http://www.crla.net/conference/2017)
- Proposals must be submitted no later than 11:59 p.m. (CST) on Monday, April 3, 2017.
- 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/session summary should follow the Guidelines for Submission (see Appendix B). Refer to the Scoring Rubric (Appendix C) for more information on proposal criteria.

- If a proposal/session summary does not conform to the Guidelines for Submission, 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 laptop.** 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 the online form by March 21, 2017. Use this link: <http://crla.net/proposals> and use the keycode “reviewer2017” in the sign up box under Review and Program Committees.

If you have any questions regarding the call for Reviewers, contact Victoria Appatova at [conferencechair@crla.net](mailto:conferencechair@crla.net)

## IMPORTANT DATES

- February 1, 2017 Call for Proposals is disseminated and online system is open for proposal submissions.
- March 21, 2017 Deadline for proposal reviewer application.
- April 3, 2017 Deadline for 2017 CRLA conference proposals. Proposals must be submitted electronically by 11:59 p.m. (CST).
- June 1, 2017 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 5, 2017 Conference registration begins.
- August 3, 2017 ***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: Learning & Study Strategies
- Strand 5: Learning Assistance Center Management
- Strand 6: Learning with Disabilities
- Strand 7: Mathematics
- Strand 8: Multicultural Issues
- Strand 9: Peer Assistance Programs
- Strand 10: Research and Evaluation
- Strand 11: Technology & Distance Learning
- Strand 12: Student Athletes
- Strand 13: Professional Development and Other Topics\*
- Strand 14: 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 noted strand, all of the program areas and topics are connected to a Special Interest Group (SIG). For questions about topic relevancy, contact the appropriate SIG Chair. 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:** Patricia Noteboom ([pnoteboom@ku.edu](mailto:pnoteboom@ku.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](mailto: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](mailto:haggardk@nsuok.edu))

**STRAND 4: 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:** Cassandra Hirdes-Tomlinson ([chirdes@email.arizona.edu](mailto:chirdes@email.arizona.edu)); Danielle Gioia ([dgioia@gse.upenn.edu](mailto:dgioia@gse.upenn.edu))

**STRAND 5: 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](mailto:jon.mladic@rasmussen.edu))

**STRAND 6: 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:** Sheryl Bone ([sbone@kaplan.edu](mailto:sbone@kaplan.edu)); Kyra Shank ([kshank@kaplan.edu](mailto:kshank@kaplan.edu))

**STRAND 7: 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](mailto:mortiz10@email.arizona.edu))

**STRAND 8: 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 Co-Chairs:** Michael Keleher ([mkeleher@kennesaw.edu](mailto:mkeleher@kennesaw.edu)); Yolanda Clarke ([yclarke@ithaca.edu](mailto:yclarke@ithaca.edu))

**STRAND 9: 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 Chair:** Wendy Simmerman ([wendy\\_simmerman@byu.edu](mailto:wendy_simmerman@byu.edu))

#### **STRAND 10: 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 Co-Chairs:** Jodi Lampi ([jlampi@niu.edu](mailto:jlampi@niu.edu)); Susan Roach ([susan.roach@elmhurst.edu](mailto:susan.roach@elmhurst.edu))

#### **STRAND 11: 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 Chair:** Crystal Bickford ([c.bickford@snhu.edu](mailto:c.bickford@snhu.edu))

#### **STRAND 12: 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:** Pamela Segal ([psegal@towson.edu](mailto:psegal@towson.edu)); Dorothy Kemp ([dkemp2@lsu.edu](mailto:dkemp2@lsu.edu))

#### **STRAND 13: 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](mailto:mccarthys@centenarycollege.edu))

#### **STRAND 14: Exhibitors**

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

**Strand Chair:** Victoria Appatova ([conferencechair@crla.net](mailto:conferencechair@crla.net))



## APPENDIX B— GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION

All proposals must be submitted electronically using CRLA's online submission system. 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 in your proposal submission:

- **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
- **Password** — for later use to edit your proposal submission, if needed
- **Session Title—10 words maximum**
- **Abstract** — 50 words maximum (to be used in the program, if accepted)
- **Strand** — see the list and description of strands in Appendix A
- **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
- **Proposal/Session Summary** – All sections of the proposal/session summary listed below with the maximum word limit should be prepared in separate document files 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** that could undermine impartiality should appear in the summary. If a summary 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 3, 2017 deadline. The summary must include information pertinent to the type of proposal being submitted. Your summary should include the following sections which are to be submitted as Microsoft Word documents in separate fields:
  - **Relevance to Conference Theme (50 words maximum)**
  - **Relevance to Conference Strand (50 words maximum)**
  - **Purpose of Presentation and Learning Objectives for Participants (200 words maximum)**
  - **Perspectives or Theoretical Framework (200 words maximum)**
  - **Results and/or Conclusions of the Study or Best Practices Report (200 words maximum)**
  - **Practical and/or Scientific Innovation and Contribution to Field (200 words maximum)**
  - **Delivery Method Including Audience Engagement (100 words maximum)**
  - **Reference List (500 words maximum):** To indicate a research base for the submission, a current and substantive reference list is a necessary component of the proposal summary. If an author cites his/her own work in the reference list, please use APA style (e.g., Author, 1999) to ensure a masked review. Even best practices reports should be grounded in sound research and theory, which will be demonstrated by this reference list.

Other attachments or appendices cannot be included in the summary. 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 proposal before submission.

## Online Submission Process and Confirmation

### Uploading your Proposal

When you are ready to submit your proposal, go to the online submission system at the CRLA website <http://crla.net/proposals>. You will be asked to input information about your presentation proposal. Complete all the fields and upload all sections of your proposal/session summary as separate Word files in designated fields.

### Password

You will need to create a password when you submit your proposal. This action will allow you to edit your proposal submission later, if needed.

### Confirmation email

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](mailto:c.lemek@crla.net)).

### Editing your Proposal

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.

If you have any questions or problems with the submission process, you may direct your inquiries to Cindy Lemek at CRLA Headquarters. Contact Cindy Monday through Friday 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](mailto:c.lemek@crla.net).

## The Review Process

Proposals undergo masked review by 3 volunteers, who independently score the proposal based on how closely it meets the criteria laid out on the Scoring Rubric. The Strand Chair then reads the proposal and all 3 reviews of each proposal within their strand. Based on the overall quality of all proposals within that strand, the Strand Chair will then make recommendations regarding rejection or acceptance to the Conference Chair. The Conference Chair makes the final determination for each proposal.

## 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>Meets Criteria</i>	<i>Does Not Meet Criteria</i>	Pts.
<b>Relevance to Conference Theme (5 pts)</b>	Relevance of title and description, as well as the presentation as a whole, to the conference theme is explicit and clear (3-5 pts).	Relevance of title and description, as well as the presentation as a whole, to the conference theme is not clear (0—2 pts).	
<b>Relevance to Conference Strand (5 pts)</b>	Relevance of title and description, as well as the presentation as a whole, to the conference strand is explicit and clear (3-5 pts).	Relevance of title and description, as well as the presentation as a whole, to the conference strand is not clear (0—2 pts).	
<b>Purpose of Presentation and Learning Objectives for Participants (20 pts)</b>	Purpose of presentation and learning objectives for participants are explicit, appropriate, and reasonable (10-20 pts).	Purpose of presentation and learning objectives for participants are unclear, inappropriate, or unreasonable (0-9 pts).	
<b>Perspectives or Theoretical Framework (10 pts)</b>	Perspectives or theoretical framework are explicit and appropriate. This presentation is based explicitly on sound theory and research (5-10 pts).	Perspectives or theoretical framework are unclear or inappropriate. This presentation has less than a strong, explicit foundation of theory and research (0-4 pts)	
<b>Results and/or Conclusions of the Study or Best Practices Report (10 pts)</b>	Results and/or conclusions of the study or best practices report are explicit and appropriate (5-10 pts).	Results and/or conclusions of the study or best practices report are unclear or inappropriate (0-4 pts).	
<b>Practical and/or Scientific Innovation and Contribution to Field (20 pts)</b>	This presentation’s practical and/or scientific innovation will make a significant contribution to the field (10-20 pts).	It is not obvious that this presentation contains practical and/or scientific innovation that could make a significant contribution to the field (0-9 pts).	
<b>Delivery Method Including Audience Engagement (5 pts)</b>	Delivery method, including audience engagement, is clear, appropriate, and effective (3-5 pts).	Delivery method, including audience engagement, is unclear, inappropriate, or ineffective (0—2 pts).	
<b>Reference List (10 pts)</b>	A robust reference list of current research is included (5-10 pts).	References are dated or incomplete (0-4 pts).	
<b>Proposal Clarity and Coherence (10 pts)</b>	The proposal overall is clearly and coherently written (5-10 pts).	The proposal overall is not clearly and/or coherently written (0-4 pts).	
	<b>REVIEWER’S RECOMMENDATION (CIRCLE ONE):</b> <b>ACCEPT REJECT</b>	<b>TOTAL POINTS:</b>	