The National Center for Leadership in Intensive Intervention recently received funding for NCLII-2, a second iteration of the NCLII training grant that, over the next 5 years, will fund 28 students from a consortium of seven universities: Vanderbilt University, University of Connecticut, University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Minnesota, University of Texas at Austin, University of Georgia and Michigan State University. The mission of NCLII-2 is to produce scholars capable of preparing generations of special education personnel to meet the needs of students with comorbid and complex learning and behavior difficulties (CLBD) and to conduct the highest level of research on this topic. For NCLII-2, we welcome 10 scholars in Cohort 1 and 9 new faculty members. See more about the new members below; for complete bios of all NCLII-2 scholars and faculty, visit nclii.org.

NCLII-2 WELCOMES NEW SCHOLARS AND FACULTY

NCLII-2 SCHOLARS, COHORT 1:

- Tessa Arsenault
  UT Austin
- Jessica Bourget
  Univ. of Connecticut
- Brennan Chandler
  Univ. of Georgia
- Gabby Crowell
  Vanderbilt
- Sarah DeAngelo
  Univ. of Illinois at Chicago
- Blair Payne
  UT Austin
- Amber Reilly
  Univ. of Minnesota
- Emily Reno
  Univ. of Minnesota
- Jillian Thoele
  Univ. of Georgia
- Elizabeth Zagata
  Univ. of Connecticut

NCLII-2 FACULTY MEMBERS:

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY:
Joe Wehby, Marcia Barnes, Doug Fuchs, Lynn Fuchs, Blair Lloyd, Jeanne Wanzek

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY:
Eunsoo Cho, Gary Trola, Adrea Truckenmiller

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT:
Mike Coyne, Devin Kearns, Jennifer Freeman, Brandi Simonsen

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA:
Kristin Sayeski, Scott Ardoin, Jennifer Lindstrom

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO:
Dan Maggin, Lisa Cushing, Marie Tejero Hughes

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA:
Frank Symons, Savana Bak, Leanne Johnson, Jennifer McComas, Kristen McMaster

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN:
Sharon Vaughn, Sarah Powell, Diane Bryant, Nathan Clemens, Chris Doabler, Jessica Toste

*new members are highlighted in orange

The fall NCLII-2 curriculum modules have included 1) Introduction to Intensive Intervention (Kristin Sayeski, Lead Instructor), 2) The Taxonomy of Intensive Intervention (Lynn Fuchs, Lead Instructor), and 3) Progress Monitoring in Intensive Intervention (Nathan Clemens, Lead Instructor).
This fall, we were not able to host its in-person All-Scholar Meeting due to pandemic-related restrictions and safety measures. In its place, we hosted a series of Zoom meetings in an effort to provide scholars with additional opportunities to learn and connect with NCLII-2 faculty and other scholars. The first meeting was an hour-long Zoom “happy hour” that was held in September to give scholars a chance to get to know one another better. Apart from a few light-hearted ice-breaker questions presented by NCLII-2 Educational Consultants Terrell McGuire and Katherine Carpenter, scholars spent that time purely socializing.

Next, we held two Zoom All-Scholar Meetings in October and November to convene faculty and scholars around targeted topics of discussion. The first of these two meetings took place on October 7. The meeting kicked off with a brief welcome by NCLII-2 Project Director Joe Wehby and an introduction from Larry Wexler, OSEP Research to Practice Division Director. Faculty and scholars then briefly introduced themselves to the group using a prepared slide template that detailed university affiliations, research interests, and one “fun fact.” Next, Joe Wehby moderated a panel discussion that focused on the following topics: 1) the definition of CLBD - How do you think about the terms complex and co-occurring? Do you think about it from a categorical perspective (e.g. comorbidity) or from a perspective of an overlapping set of disorders along some continuum? What about difficulties that are complex and co-occur within a domain (e.g. math and reading difficulties or anxiety and aggressive behavior)? Do you think these terms mean different things to different researchers? and 2) intensive intervention for academics and behavior - When we talk about combining academics and behavior, are we talking about truly providing intervention in both areas, or, are we talking about supplementing academic interventions with behavioral/emotional support and/or supplementing emotional/behavioral interventions with academic support? Over the past decade or so, there has been much discussion around the need for integrating academic and emotional/behavioral interventions, but there does not appear to have been much movement toward an integrative approach. What are the barriers for such work in terms of research and practice? Faculty panelists included Mike Coyne (UConn), Doug Fuchs (Vanderbilt), Dan Maggin (UIC), Kristin Sayeski (UGA), Frank Symons (UMN), Gary Troia (MSU), and Sharon Vaughn (UT Austin). Additional faculty members who attended the meeting and participated in breakout discussions included Marcia Barnes (Vanderbilt), Lynn Fuchs (Vanderbilt), and Sarah Powell (UT Austin).

The second All-Scholar meeting was held on November 11 and again consisted of brief introductions, a faculty-led panel conversation moderated by Joe Wehby, and breakout room discussions with small groups of scholars and faculty. The panel discussion focused on the tiered frameworks (RTI, MTSS, PBIS) that schools primarily use to address academic and behavioral difficulties, yet how these often fail to meet the needs of students with complex learning and behavior difficulties. Specifically, panelists addressed the following questions: 1) Is there a research to practice gap within these multi-tiered approaches? 2) Is this a knowledge gap vs. implementation gap? What don’t we know? 3) Are these issues different in systems mostly focused on behavior vs. those targeting academic deficits? And 4) What type of research is need within these systems to improve the outcomes for students with CLBD? Panelists for this meeting included Scott Ardoin (UGA), Mike Coyne (UConn), Chris Doabler (UT Austin), Dan Maggin (UIC), Kristen McMaster (UMN), Brandi Simonsen (UConn), Adrea Truckenmiller (MSU), and Jeannie Wanzek (Vanderbilt). Following the panel, scholars met together in their breakout rooms for several minutes to formulate specific questions for further discussion before faculty joined them for the remainder of the meeting.

While meeting virtually has not been ideal, scholars and faculty have given positive feedback regarding these meetings and have rated them as informative and helpful in creating connections within the consortium.