



A Publication of the Council for Learning Disabilities December 2018

## President's Message



Dear CLD Members,

It was so nice seeing all of you who attended our special 40th anniversary conference in Portland this fall. To those of you who were unable to attend the conference this year, you were missed! Be sure to read about the conference highlights later in this issue of the *LD Forum*. We hope to see you *all* at next year's conference to be held in San Antonio, Texas. The call for proposals should be coming out any time and will be due in early February, so be sure to keep the deadline on your radar.

Thank you to all who made this year's conference a success! It was CLD's first time in Portland, and the response from attendees was very positive. Thank you to our Local Arrangements Committee for making us feel welcome. The conference ran smoothly thanks to the hard work of Conference Program Chair Lindy Crawford; Conference Committee Co-Chairs Anne Brawand and Judy Voress; the Board of Trustees; and Executive Director Linda Nease. Thank you also to the efforts of our past presidents, led by Monica Lambert and Gerry Wallace, to make this year's conference extra special.

We also had a successful second annual Leadership Institute on the day prior to the conference. Thank you to Leadership Development Committee Co-Chair Diane Bryant for putting together such a strong schedule of events for the early career participants who are learning about and becoming involved in our CLD community. In addition, our 7th annual Leadership Academy cohort was selected and announced at this year's conference. Congratulations to Amy Kunkel, Lydia Gerzel-Short, Alexcia Moore, Jere Kelly, Soyong Park, and Alex Smith!

We had some exciting action at our Annual Business Meeting as well. Our newest past-president, Deborah Reed, announced our slate of candidates for this year's election for officers on the Executive Committee. Candidates for treasurer are Beverly Weiser and Trisha Strickland. Candidates for vice-president are Endia Lindo and Joe Morgan. Thank you to our candidates for putting their hats in the ring, and good luck! Be on the lookout for the election ballot, which will be sent out in the next few months—be sure to vote!

In the business meeting, the Board of Trustees also made a very special award. Judy Voress has been a long-term member of both the organization and the Board of Trustees. She took over the CLD Conference in 2011 and has consistently gone above and beyond to make the conference the success that it is today. Her quiet, Herculean efforts did not go unnoticed. This is Judy's last year as conference chair, and the Board of Trustees felt it was important for her mark on the conference to be remembered. You will see in next year's program that the luncheon will now be known as the "Judy Voress Networking Luncheon." Thank you, Judy!

Finally, I also want to give a special thank you to our Weiderholt Distinguished Lecturer, Don Hammill, who reprised and updated his keynote at the very first CLD Conference 40 years ago. Each year, the Past President's Council is charged with selecting the Weiderholt Distinguished Lecturer for the following year's conference. I am pleased to announce that they have selected Diane Bryant to be our speaker at next year's conference. Congratulations, Diane!

The conference may be over, but our work as an organization is not done. All of our committees continue to work diligently to fulfill the mission of the organization. One important item that is currently being addressed comes from our Liaison Committee, chaired by Debi Gartland and Roberta Strosnider, who represent CLD on the National Joint Committee on

*(continued on page 8)*

**In This Issue . . .**

- President's Message . . . . . 1
- Current Issues in Review . . . . . 2
- Conference Highlights . . . . . 6
- LDC Post Conference Report . . . . . 7
- Open Positions and Candidates . . . . . 8-9
- Committee & Chapter News . . . . . 9
- CLD Conference Sponsors . . . . . 10

## Current Issues in Review

**Editor's Note:** This column is designed to provide CLD members with a synopsis of the current information available in the literature related to a specific topic in the field of learning disabilities. Author(s) are asked to provide an overview of the literature and recommendations for next steps in addressing the identified issues.

### Response to Intervention in Secondary Schools

**Stephanie Morano, Ph.D.**  
University of Virginia

**Benikia Kressler, Ph.D.**  
California State University, Fullerton

**Laura J. Isbell, Ph.D.**  
Texas A&M University, Commerce

**Lara-Jeane C. Costa, Ph.D.**  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

**Katie M. Miller, Ph.D.**  
Florida Atlantic University

Educators across the country are implementing the Response to Intervention (RTI) service delivery model, but empirical support for the practice is sparse, especially at the secondary level. Many researchers interested in RTI avoid middle and high school settings for their investigations due to complications related to scheduling and compliance (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Compton, 2010), and because of the difficulty in determining the target of intervention for potential academic problems in secondary level content. Thus, the need for guidance on RTI implementation is “particularly pronounced” at the secondary level (Regan, Berkeley, Hughes, & Brady, 2015).

#### RTI: Benefits and Challenges

*Response to Intervention* (RTI) is a multi-tier educational delivery model that aims to provide a framework for appropriate instruction for all students. In general, when an RTI model is implemented with fidelity, schools (a) provide effective, research-based instruction in the general education classroom; (b) use universal screening measures and frequent progress monitoring to assess student learning; (c) provide increasingly intensive supports to students who demonstrate need based on progress monitoring performance; and (d) reduce disproportionate representation of students of color identified with disabilities (Klingner & Edwards, 2006). In effect, RTI provides a responsive alternative to the “wait to fail” approach associated with the traditional IQ-achievement discrepancy model for identifying and serving students in need.

Although the effects of RTI for students at risk for specific learning disabilities are promising (e.g., Fagella-Luby & Wardell, 2011), RTI implementation presents various challenges, particularly in secondary settings. Specifically, these challenges include scheduling, collaboration between teachers, progress monitoring and assessment, and designing effective intervention programs (King, Lemons, & Hill, 2012). These challenges are underscored by the fact that RTI has not been implemented in secondary settings at the same rate as in elementary settings (Vaughn & Fletcher, 2012). Consequently, while there is a growing body of research highlighting the needs of secondary teachers when implementing RTI (Berkeley, Bender, Gregg Peaster, & Saunders,

2009), there is little research to support the effectiveness of RTI within secondary settings (King, Lemons, & Hill, 2012).

There are two overarching approaches to RTI implementation: the standard protocol approach and the problem-solving approach (Fuchs, Mock, Morgan, & Young, 2003). The *standard protocol approach* relies on comprehensive, validated interventions using specified procedures (VanDerHeyden, 2018). Research on the standard protocol approach has largely been conducted in the context of elementary level reading instruction (e.g., Torgesen et al., 2001) and therefore has limited applicability to secondary settings. The *problem-solving approach*, in contrast, does not rely on any particular intervention program. Instead, the problem-solving approach involves working with a school-based team to identify and analyze a problem, develop and implement a plan to address the problem, and finally, to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan (VanDerHeyden, 2018). The problem-solving approach for RTI service delivery is often recommended for secondary settings because it provides flexibility and individualization (King et al., 2012).

Using the small body of available evidence, we consider some possible methods to managing the challenges associated with scheduling, collaboration, assessment, and intervention design within secondary settings in the context of Deno's (2005) **IDEAL** problem-solving model for RTI. This model involves: (a) **I**dentifying the problem, (b) **D**efining the problem, (c) **E**xamining **A**lternatives, and (d) **L**ooking at the effects. The IDEAL model ensures that decisions are driven by data collection and evaluation (Ball & Christ, 2012). Therefore, Deno's IDEAL problem-solving model offers a useful framework for addressing the challenges presented by RTI implementation in secondary settings.

#### Considerations for Addressing Scheduling Challenges Within Secondary Settings

Small-group interventions delivered by interventionists in order to address specific learning challenges are the “hallmark” of RTI (Burns, 2008). However, at the secondary level, students' and teachers' schedules can be complex, and

(continued on page 3)

finding adequate time to provide intervention sessions can be challenging. Within the IDEAL framework (Deno, 2005), addressing scheduling challenges would take place during the “examining alternatives” phase, after learning problems have been identified and defined. While examining alternatives, the school-based team would consider various possibilities for integrating intervention into students’ schedules. Some middle and high schools opt to provide intervention sessions during elective periods or during existing “flex” class periods. Alternatively, a school might opt to provide intervention within a traditional content course that has been carefully planned to incorporate time for intervention without sacrificing time for content-area instruction.

The structure of courses designed to include intervention sessions will depend on specific school characteristics and scheduling practices. For example, a school might opt to provide high quality content area (e.g., biology) instruction for all students, and targeted, small-group intervention for identified struggling readers within a traditional biology course using a combination of whole-class and small-group teaching formats. After a whole-class activity, small-group activities could be used to engage all students in content-focused literacy activities. During this time, an interventionist could “push in” to the class to implement an intervention targeting the specific reading needs of a small group of identified students using the biology textbook or lower-level text focused on the current topic of study (Burns, 2008). This format allows students to receive targeted reading intervention without losing valuable content-area instructional time. See Table 1 for additional resources for scheduling RTI service delivery in secondary settings.

### Considerations for Addressing Collaboration Challenges

Successful implementation of Deno’s (2005) IDEAL problem-solving model requires collaboration amongst all members of the RTI team. Murawski and Hughes (2009) define *collaboration* as the “interaction between profession-

als who offer different areas of expertise yet share responsibilities and goals” (p. 269). In secondary settings, RTI team members often include general education teachers of content-area classes, special educators, intervention specialists, administrators, related service providers, and other school personnel. While considering different approaches for addressing learning challenges, teams should discuss how team members will work together effectively. Roles and responsibilities must be defined, and opportunities for communication and co-planning must be provided. Some collaboration challenges to consider include time, setting, and key personnel.

Finding a time and place for RTI team members to successfully collaborate and engage in problem solving can be challenging. Administrators can support collaboration within an RTI model by allowing members of the team to have a common block of time free from teaching, and a common working environment to use to evaluate student data and collaboratively plan for instruction. Furthermore, administrators should build RTI teams that include support personnel who can provide needed expertise (i.e., speech-language pathologists or school counselors; Friend & Cook, 2003). In addition, personnel may need time and support to determine where to focus intervention efforts. Teams may need to collaborate with support personnel or coaches to think creatively about how to implement skill-based intervention within the context of content area instruction, and how to implement content-based intervention in consideration of basic skill needs.

Co-teaching—shared between a general, content area teacher and a special educator—is a popular and useful method for collaborative service provision in secondary schools. Co-teaching is an educational delivery model that includes co-planning, co-instruction and co-assessing of students with varying abilities within the general education classroom (Murawski & Hughes, 2009). Co-teaching can be used to improve the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction, and to support struggling students by ensuring that lessons are research-based, address the needs of all students, and incorporate ongoing data collection and progress monitoring (Murawski & Hughes, 2009). Other co-teaching models can

(continued on page 4)

**Table 1.** National Center on Response to Intervention Secondary Scheduling Resources

Resource Title	Type	Link
Tiered Interventions in High Schools: Using Preliminary ‘Lessons Learned’ to Guide Ongoing Discussion	Guide/Report	<a href="https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/HSTII_lessonsLearned.pdf">https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/HSTII_lessonsLearned.pdf</a>
Contextual Factors Planning Template	Planning Template	<a href="https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/Contextual_Factors_NCRTI.pdf">https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/Contextual_Factors_NCRTI.pdf</a>
RTI Scheduling Processes for Middle Schools	Guide/Report	<a href="https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/068IMS_RTI_Rescheduling_Brief_d2.pdf">https://rti4success.org/sites/default/files/068IMS_RTI_Rescheduling_Brief_d2.pdf</a>
Response to Intervention in Middle School: Considerations for Implementation	Training Module	<a href="https://rti4success.org/resource/response-intervention-middle-schools-considerations-implementation">https://rti4success.org/resource/response-intervention-middle-schools-considerations-implementation</a>

also be used to support Tier II implementation. For example, co-teachers might use a model in which one teacher provides intervention instruction to a small group while the other leads whole-class instruction. It is important to note that effective co-teaching requires careful planning and administrative support. One useful resource for secondary educators seeking information on co-teaching is the Collaborate to Co-Teach website from the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education (<http://faculty.virginia.edu/coteachUVA/>). The site includes video demonstrations of the five different co-teaching models, a template for collaborative planning, and guidelines for co-teaching implementation.

### Considerations for Addressing Data Collection and Progress Monitoring

Assessment and progress monitoring data are integral elements of the IDEAL (Deno, 2005) problem-solving model because student data is used to identify the problem and to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan (i.e., to monitor student progress and drive movement between tiers). In order to identify the problem, or determine which students may need intervention, secondary schools may opt to use existing data sources as universal screening tools. Academic goals in secondary settings focus on mastery of specific content-area knowledge (Feuerborn, Sarin, & Tyre, 2011) and secondary students take state standardized assessments to measure their learning of content-area standards. In effect, these standardized state test scores can be used as a time- and cost-efficient method for universal screening within an RTI framework. Although standardized tests scores can be used as one component of the universal screening process, other benchmarking measures should be used to confirm standardized test scores and to screen new students or those with missing scores (Johnson, Pool, & Carter, 2012).

After screening, RTI implementation requires frequent and targeted progress monitoring to assess students' responsiveness to intervention. RTI team members with appropriate training should analyze progress monitoring data in order to more clearly define "the problem" by identifying students' specific strengths and weaknesses. In order to make efficient use of time, progress monitoring probes—such as curriculum-based measures (CBMs)—might be designed as weekly quizzes and integrated into classroom practice. The website of the Research Institute on Progress Monitoring ([www.progressmonitoring.org](http://www.progressmonitoring.org)) is an excellent resource that secondary educators can use to guide assessment development and implementation. Some evidence suggests that a minimum of 5 or 6 weeks of data with multiple collection points per week is needed to support educational decisions regarding the effectiveness of an intervention (Ardoin, Christ, Morena, Cormier, & Klingbeil, 2013). Ultimately, however, the frequency of progress monitoring data collection should be

determined by the sensitivity of the measure to change over time and the availability of alternate or parallel measures. In addition to screening and progress monitoring, data collection procedures in secondary RTI should include teacher observations focused on student behavior during instruction, as well as parent notes and comments regarding behavior while completing homework. This will create a clear, comprehensive understanding of students' strengths and challenges, which educators can use in designing responsive instruction.

### Considerations for Designing Effective Intervention

One significant challenge that secondary teams encounter when using a problem-solving approach to RTI implementation is determining how to address the needs of struggling students within the context of their content classes. Identifying content needs can be difficult because there is not a standardized method for doing so. In addition, general academic skill challenges can seriously hinder content learning. For students struggling academically, remediation of academic skill challenges within content classrooms can improve progress. For example, research has demonstrated that teaching a simple self-questioning strategy to middle school students in an inclusive social studies content class can significantly improve students' comprehension of their grade-level textbook (Berkeley, Marshak, Mastropieri, & Scruggs, 2011). In effect, teachers can improve students' access to content learning by remediating general academic skills.

There is limited but promising research to guide RTI teams in planning interventions at the "explore alternative interventions" phase of Deno's (2005) IDEAL model. The available research suggests that older students need greater intervention intensity to significantly improve their academic performance (Vaughn et al., 2008; Vaughn & Fletcher, 2012). As noted earlier, there are few validated intervention programs for secondary students, but those programs that are available can be identified using Intervention Central ([interventioncentral.org](http://interventioncentral.org)), the Institute of Education Sciences' *What Works Clearinghouse* (<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>), and the *Best Evidence Encyclopedia* (<http://www.bestevidence.org>).

Even when appropriate interventions are identified, school personnel may not know how to effectively intensify interventions to meet the learning needs of students (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Malone, 2017). Fuchs, Fuchs, and Malone (2017) recently published a taxonomy of intervention intensity that secondary educators can use as a guide in designing efficient and effective intervention with an RTI framework. The taxonomy (Fuchs et al., 2017) is another useful tool for teams during the "examine alternative interventions" phase of the IDEAL model (Deno, 2005). When evaluating and planning to intensify intervention to meet students' needs, teams can customize how each of the seven principles in the taxonomy is applied. The seven principles are strength, dosage, alignment,

(continued on page 5)

attention to transfer, complexity, behavioral support, and individualization (see Fuchs et al., 2017 for a more detailed description). Progress monitoring, as described in the previous section, is at the core of the individualization dimension of the taxonomy. *Strength* refers to effectiveness of an intervention program as evidenced by the effect sizes associated with gains for students with intensive needs. *Dosage* refers to the amount of time students are actively engaged in intervention. *Alignment* refers to the specificity of the match between the intervention program and both target learning objectives and a student's specific strengths and needs. *Attention to transfer* refers to the attention paid to teaching generalization of intervention skills and content. *Complexity* refers to the number of elements of explicit instruction built into intervention instruction, and *behavioral support* refers to how effectively the intervention promotes behavior self-management and self-regulation (see Fuchs et al., 2017 for detailed information about each dimension of intensity).

Given the limited number of validated intervention programs for secondary students, Fuchs et al.'s taxonomy is a valuable resource for secondary educators faced with the challenge of designing or intensifying effective intervention programming for their students. For example, if progress monitoring data indicate that a student or group of students are not responding to intervention, the school-based team may decide to implement a more intensive intervention by increasing the dosage, decreasing intervention group size, or readjusting the alignment of the current intervention with content.

## Conclusion

RTI implementation at the secondary level presents a variety of unique challenges, including those associated with scheduling, collaboration, assessment and progress monitoring, and intervention design. Although more research is needed to determine best practices across these different areas, we have outlined recommendations and provided practical resources for each area based on the current bodies of relevant literature. Moving forward, there is a great need for researchers to investigate RTI implementation at the secondary level in order to validate best practices for the unique challenges presented. Guidance for implementation of RTI in secondary settings, specifically focusing on instruction and intervention across tiers and the demands placed on both special and general educators, is essential.

## References

Ardoin, S. P., Christ, T. J., Morena, L. S., Cormier, D. C., & Klingbeil, D. A. (2013). A systematic review and summarization of the recommendations and research surrounding Curriculum-Based Measurement of oral reading fluency (CBM-R) decision rules. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2012.09.004>

Ball, C. R., & Christ, T. J. (2012). Supporting valid decision making: Uses and misuses of assessment data within the context of RTI.

*Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.21592>

Berkeley, S., Bender, W. N., Gregg Peaster, L., & Saunders, L. (2009). Implementation of response to intervention: A snapshot of progress. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42*, 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219408326214>

Berkeley, S., Marshak, L., Mastropieri, M. A., & Scruggs, T. E. (2011). Improving student comprehension of social studies text: A self-questioning strategy for inclusive middle school classes. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*, 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510361261>

Burns M. K. (2008). *Implementing response-to-intervention in elementary and secondary schools: Procedures to assure scientific-based practices*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Deno, S. L. (2005). Problem solving assessment. In R. Brown-Chidsey (Ed.), *Assessment for intervention: A problem-solving approach* (pp. 10–42). New York, NY: Guilford.

Fagella-Luby, M., & Wardwell, M. (2011). RTI in a middle school: Findings and practical implications of a tier 2 reading comprehension study. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 34*, 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073194871103400103>

Feuerborn, L. L., Sarin, K., & Tyre, A. D. (2011). Response to intervention in secondary schools. *Principal Leadership, 11*, 50–54.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2003). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D. L. (2010). Rethinking response to intervention at middle and high school. *School Psychology Review, 39*, 22–28.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Malone, A. S. (2017). The taxonomy of intervention intensity. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 50*, 35–43.

Fuchs, D., Mock, D., Morgan, P. L., & Young, C. L. (2003). Responsiveness-to-Intervention: Definitions, evidence, and implications for the learning disabilities construct. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 18*, 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5826.00072>

Johnson, E. S., Pool, J. L., & Carter, D. R. (2012). *Screening for reading problems in an RTI framework*. Retrieved from <http://www.rtinetwork.org/essential/assessment/screening/screening-for-reading-problems-in-an-rti-framework>

King, S. A., Lemons, C. J., & Hill, D. R. (2012). Response to intervention in secondary schools: Considerations for administrators. *NASSP Bulletin, 96*, 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636511430551>

Klingner, J. K., & Edwards, P. (2006). Cultural considerations with response-to-intervention models. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 108–117.

Murawski, W. W., & Hughes, C. E. (2009). Response to intervention, collaboration, and co-teaching: A logical combination for successful systemic change. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 53*, 267–277. <https://doi.org/10.3200/PSFL.53.4.267-277>

National Center on Response to Intervention. (March 2010). *Essential components of RTI—A closer look at response to intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention.

National Center on Response to Intervention. (July 2011). *RTI scheduling processes for middle schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention.

National High School Center, National Center on Response to Intervention, and Center on Instruction. (2010). *Tiered interventions in high schools: Using preliminary “lessons learned” to guide ongoing discussion*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

(continued on page 6)

(Current Issues in Review, continued from page 5)

Regan, K. S., Berkeley, S. L., Hughes, M., & Brady, K. K. (2015). Understanding practitioner perceptions of responsiveness to intervention. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 38, 234–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731948715580437>

Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K. S., & Conway, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34, 33–58.

VanDerHeyden, A. (2018) *Approaches to RTI*. Retrieved from <http://www.rtinetwork.org/learn/what/approaches-to-rti>

Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. M. (2012). Response to Intervention with secondary school students with reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 45, 244–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219412442157>

Vaughn, S., Fletcher, J. M., Francis, D. J., Denton, C. A., Wanzek, J., Wexler, J., ... Romain, M. A. (2008). Response to intervention with older students with reading difficulties. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 18, 338–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2008.05.001>

## Conference Highlights

This year, CLD's 40th Anniversary International Conference on Learning Disabilities was held in Portland, Oregon on October 11-12, 2018. Over 300 professional educators, researchers, and graduate students from the United States and Canada registered for this year's conference, which was enriched by the participation of established scholars (17 CLD past-presidents were in attendance), and newer scholars to the field of learning disabilities (28 of whom attended CLD's Pre-Conference Leadership Institute).

CLD President Sheri Berkeley opened the conference on Thursday, October 11, 2018, by introducing Past President Gerry Wallace, who then introduced this year's Lee Wiederholt Distinguished Lecturer, Don Hammill (Hammill Institute on Learning Disabilities). Notably, Dr. Hammill provided the



keynote presentation at the first conference held by CLD (then, DCLD), in 1979. Forty years later, at this year's conference, he highlighted how, in spite

of the many advances we have made in the field of learning disabilities, persistent challenges remain. Research and practice designed to address some of these challenges were presented during the conference in the form of content-specific panels, thematic roundtable sessions, interactive papers, and structured poster sessions. Conference topics included, but were not limited to, evidence-based practices in literacy, mathematics interventions, teacher preparation, cultural and linguistic diversity, affective and behavioral interventions, and special education law. Approximately 250 different scholars in the field of learning disabilities presented at this year's conference, joined by numerous members of CLD's current and past Leadership Academies and the recipients of CLD's Must Read Awards (Sara Jozwik, University of Wisconsin, Madison and Hannah Matthews, lead author,



Boston University), and Outstanding Researcher Award (Ashley Parker Shiels, Ph.D., 2017, Southern Methodist University). Congratulations are also

extended to the recipients of CLD's "Teacher of the Year Award" (Samantha Bos, TX; Janice Converse, VA; Santosh Kamalakar, AZ; and Hydee Parker, CO), and the "Floyd G. Hudson Service Award" (Lynne Fitzhugh, CO; and Judy Voress, TX).

Many thanks to all who selflessly volunteered hours of their time to ensure the success of the 40th anniversary conference. An enormous debt of gratitude is shared with



Conference Planning Committee Co-Chairs Judy Voress (Hammill Institute on Disabilities), and Anne Brawand (Kutztown University) for their tireless efforts toward ensuring a well-organized and well-received conference. Notably, Judy Voress was

honored for her 35 years of service to CLD through the establishment of the conference's "Judy Voress Networking Luncheon," formally approved during the Business Meeting. Thank you also to Linda Nease (CLD Executive Director), Technology Committee Co-Chair Joe Morgan (University of Nevada, Las Vegas), and the Local Arrangements Committee (Co-Chairs Maria Peterson-Ahmad, Western Oregon University, and Nancy Nelson, University of Oregon). Much appreciation is also extended to CLD members who completed blind peer reviews of conference proposals.

Finally, thanks to everyone who attended the conference and to those who have provided feedback. We have already received 119 conference evaluations! We promise to synthesize your feedback and use it to improve on our efforts during next year's International Conference on Learning Disabilities in San Antonio, TX (October 3–4, 2019). See you next year!

**Lindy Crawford, Ph.D.**  
**Conference Program Chair**  
**CLD President-Elect**

# Leadership Development Committee (LDC) Post-Conference Report

The LDC co-chairs are pleased to provide this update about activities stemming from the 2018 CLD 40th anniversary conference.

## Chapters:

- Arizona Chapter (in progress)
- Colorado Chapter
- Maryland Chapter
- Nevada Chapter
- Oregon Chapter (in progress)
- Texas Chapter
- Texas Student Chapter
- Virginia Chapter

## Awards:

- **CLD Outstanding Educator/Teacher of the Year Award**
  - Hydee Maria Parker – Colorado Chapter, Math Teacher, Centennial Middle
  - Samantha Bos – Texas Chapter, Special Education Teacher, The Winston School
  - Janice Converse – Virginia Chapter, Special Education Teacher, Fort Defiance High
  - Santosh Kamalakar – Arizona Chapter, Special Education Teacher, The Children’s Center for the Neurodevelopmental Studies
- **The Floyd G. Hudson Service Award**
  - Judy K. Voress, Ph.D. – Texas Chapter, Donald D. Hammill Foundation
  - Lynne Fitzhugh, Ph.D. – Colorado Chapter, The Colorado Literacy and Learning Center

## CLD Leadership Institute (LI)

CLD was pleased to provide the CLD Leadership Institute on the day prior to the conference. Twenty-eight graduate students and early career scholars attended the LI.

Sessions were led by CLD leaders, editors of CLD-affiliated journals, prominent CLD members, and researchers, including Brian R. Bryant (Past President, co-editor of *Learning Disability Quarterly*), Randy Boone (co-editor of *Intervention in School & Clinic*), Mari Cary (University of Oregon), Ben Clarke (University of Oregon), Don Hammill (past president), Kyle Higgins (co-editor of *Intervention in School & Clinic*), Rob Ochsendorf (program director EHR/DRL, National Science Foundation), Donna Sacco (Leadership Academy Cohort 6), Gerry Wallace (past president), and Kelly Williams (University of Indiana). Session topics

included a brief overview of the history of CLD and the field of LD; balancing service and teaching/research responsibilities; finding postgraduate employment (e.g., interviewing effectively, determining the best person–employment match); establishing a research agenda, building your vita, and obtaining funding; strategies for successfully conducting research within local school districts; expert advice related to networking and collaborating on scholarship; and getting ready for the third-year review.

The Leadership Development Committee will be sending out new information about the next LI event to the CLD membership later this year.

## Leadership Academy (LA)

CLD is committed to building the leadership capacity of professionals who are entering the special education field. These professionals may be in the first or second year of a university position or in the dissertation phase of their Ph.D. program. The goal of the Leadership Academy is to support the development of the leadership potential of individuals who are very interested in assuming an active role in CLD. Participation in the Leadership Academy provides the opportunity to network with colleagues and receive mentoring from highly regarded leaders in the field of LD. Leadership Academy individuals participate on CLD committees and attend CLD conferences. They may hold a role on a local, state, or national level in service to individuals with LD and their families.

This year we are pleased to announce LA Cohort 7 members: Lydia Gerzel-Short, Jerae Kelly, Amy Kunkel, Alexcia Moore, Soyoun Park, and Alex Smith.

Questions about chapter start-up and development should be directed to Leadership Development Co-Chair Minnie Mize, at [mizem@winthrop.edu](mailto:mizem@winthrop.edu), and questions about the CLD LA and LI should be directed to Leadership Development Co-Chair Diane Bryant, at [dpbryant@austin.utexas.edu](mailto:dpbryant@austin.utexas.edu).

## Description of Open Positions

### Vice President Duties:

- (a) serve in the President's place and with the President's authority in case of absence or disability of the President and President-Elect
- (b) assist the President and President-Elect in the planning and preparing of the plan of operation, charges to committees, and annual budget
- (c) assist the President and perform such other duties as may be assigned to the office
- (d) serve as member of the Bylaws and Rules Committee
- (e) serve as Program Chair for the following year's Conference

**Term:** Vice-President serves a one-year term, beginning July 1, 2019, and automatically succeeds to become President-Elect, President, and Past President.

### Treasurer Duties:

- (a) be the custodian of all funds and shall maintain detailed accounts of all receipts and expenditures for which an accounting shall be rendered to the Annual Business Meeting, the BOT, and the EC at each regular meeting, or at any time when so requested by these bodies or by the President
- (b) assist the President-Elect in the preparation of the annual budget for recommendation by the EC and approval by the BOT
- (c) recommend for approval to the BOT fiscal policies for the organization to follow that shall include banking and annual fiscal review procedures

**Term:** Three consecutive years, beginning July 1, 2019.

## Candidates for the Position of Vice President

The CLD is pleased to announce that Dr. Endia Lindo and Dr. Joseph Morgan have elected to run for the position of Vice President. Each has provided a brief bio and picture. Best of luck to each of our candidates!



**Endia Lindo, Ph.D.**, is an assistant professor of special education in the College of Education at Texas Christian University (TCU), and institute faculty in the Alice Neeley Special Education Research and Service Institute. Her research focuses on improving the reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities (LD) and building competence in various stakeholders (i.e., educators, families, evaluators, and administrators), in order to improve the implementation and sustainability of research-based interventions. Dr. Lindo has worked for over 20 years to enhance the learning outcomes for students with disabilities. In addition to her teaching and research, she brings the perspective of a parent of an elementary student diagnosed with dyslexia. Dr. Lindo has been an active member of the CLD and its Diversity Committee since 2012; she has also served on the editorial boards of *LD Forum*, *Intervention in School and Clinic*, and more recently *Learning Disability Quarterly*. Her research and service put her in a unique

position to continue the work of facilitating collaborative partnerships among professionals, and ensuring a diverse body of voices are heard, served, and developed as leaders in our field.



**Joseph Morgan, Ph.D.**, is an associate professor of special education in the Department of Early Childhood, Multilingual, and Special Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Dr. Morgan has been a member of CLD since 2012 and has served in a variety of capacities, including as Technology Committee co-chair, member of the Communications Committee, and editor of *LD Forum*. During his time with CLD, he worked with his Technology co-chair to redesign the organization's website, developed online submission systems for conference abstracts and award nominees, and redesigned the *LD Forum* submission guidelines through the development of two new columns for the newsletter.

*(President's Message, continued from page 1)*

Learning Disabilities (NJCLD). The NJCLD is currently working on a position statement that responds to federal policy proposals that would abolish or diminish the U.S. Department of Education. For example, one plan out of the White House proposes to merge the U.S. Department of Education with the Department of Labor. Be sure to be on the lookout for updates on this issue

and other important policy issues that impact our work serving students with learning disabilities and their families. A good starting place to learn more would be to read the NJCLD position paper that is featured in the current issue (Volume 41, Issue 4) of CLD's flagship journal, *Learning Disability Quarterly*.

**Sheri Berkeley**  
CLD President

## Candidates for the Position of Treasurer

The CLD is pleased to announce that Dr. Beverly Weiser and Dr. Tricia Strickland have elected to run for the position of Treasurer. Each has provided a brief bio and picture. Best of luck to each of our candidates!



**Beverly Weiser, Ph.D.**, is a research associate professor at Southern Methodist University (SMU) in Dallas, Texas, where she is the director of the Institute for Evidence-Based Education. She also teaches master's-level education students. Dr. Weiser has been dedicated to providing professional development workshops, disseminating research and practitioner-friendly articles, creating and providing instructional resources, and providing information on learning disabilities to educators and other school stakeholders. Formerly, Dr. Weiser taught grades K–12 in a variety of schools across Texas. Dr. Weiser has been a participating CLD member since 2009, and she was in the first cohort of the Leadership Academy. Serving as Treasurer will allow Dr. Weiser to collaborate more closely with other members to support children with learning disabilities and the parents and professionals who work with them. Having maintained

a multi-million-dollar grant budget, she feels prepared to follow CLD's fiscal policies and agendas and make the best financial decisions for CLD's funds and its future.



**Tricia K. Strickland, Ph.D.**, is an associate professor of education at Hood College in Frederick, Maryland. She teaches courses in special education instructional methods and behavior management. Dr. Strickland received her doctorate in special education with a concentration in mathematics education from the University of Maryland. Her area of research focuses on mathematics instructional interventions that assist students with high incidence disabilities access the general education curriculum. Previously, Dr. Strickland spent 12 years teaching mathematics to middle and high school students with diverse learning needs.

## Committee & Chapter News

### Updates from Texas CLD

Greetings from Texas! Many of our members attended and presented at the 40th annual CLD conference in Portland, Oregon. Two Texas CLD members, Judith Voress and Samantha Bos, were recognized as recipients of prestigious CLD awards. Judith, the executive director of the Hammill Institute on Disabilities, was presented with the Floyd G. Hudson Outstanding Service Award. Samantha, a special education teacher at the Winston School, was presented with the Teacher of the Year Award. Congratulations to Judy and Samantha!

The Texas A&M University–San Antonio CLD student chapter—the first and only national CLD student chapter—hit a record number of 68 members this fall. The chapter launched a campaign called “See the ABLE, not the LABEL” to serve the local community. See the ABLE!

Mark your calendars for February 7, 2019, and join Texas CLD for a one-day conference featuring special education expert and WrightsLaw founder Pete Wright. The conference will focus on special education law, assessment, SMART IEPs, and strategies for effective advocacy. Please visit our website for details and registration at <http://texas.cld.strikingly.com/>. I hope to see you in Houston!

**Mariya Davis**  
President of Texas CLD

### Updates from Colorado CLD

Colorado Council for Learning Disabilities (CCLD) recently attended the CLD conference in Portland, Oregon. CCLD was excited to have two award winners, Hydee Parker (Teacher of the Year), and Lynn Fitzhugh (Floyd G. Hudson). The two award winners are featured in the photo below along with the president of CCLD, Sabrina Raugutt. Sabrina also had a poster at the CLD conference promoting the CCLD board and all the things CCLD accomplishes in Colorado.

**Sabrina Raugutt**  
President of CCLD



from left to right: Lynn Fitzhugh, Sabrina Raugutt, and Hydee Parker

Sabrina Raugutt

(continued on page 10)

(Committee & Chapter News, continued from page 9)

## Updates from Virginia CLD

The 2019 Virginia Council for Learning Disabilities (VCLD) Symposium will be held on April 27, 2019, at Old Dominion University. Current and future special and general educators of students with disabilities in pre-K, elementary, and secondary classrooms are encouraged to

attend. Information about the symposium, including the call for proposals and additional conference details, can be found on the VCLD website at [vclld.org](http://vclld.org). The opening session hosts a panel of experts from Virginia sharing their expertise on inclusive practices for all students.

**Clara Hauth**  
President of VCLD

## CLD Conference Sponsors

The CLD acknowledges the support of the following organizations and companies for financial sponsorships or in kind-donations.

- ANSERS Institute, Texas Christian University
- Behavioral Research and Teaching, University of Oregon
- Center on Teaching and Learning, University of Oregon
- College of Education, George Mason University
- Donald D. Hammill Foundation
- Eagle Hill
- George Mason University
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
- Laselle
- PRO-ED, Inc.
- Sage Publishing
- Saddleback Educational Publishing
- Trinity University
- UNC Charlotte
- Understood

## CLD Mission & Vision

**Mission Statement:** The Council for Learning Disabilities (CLD), an international organization composed of professionals who represent diverse disciplines, is committed to enhancing the education and quality of life for individuals with learning disabilities across the life span. CLD accomplishes this by promoting and disseminating evidence-based research and practices related to the education of individuals with learning disabilities. In addition, CLD fosters (a) collaboration among professionals; (b) development of leaders in the field; and (c) advocacy for policies that support individuals with learning disabilities at local, state, and national levels.

**Vision Statement:** All individuals with learning disabilities are empowered to achieve their potential.