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Welcome to the University of Essex, and to the first event organised jointly by ALDinHE and Baleap. Our theme stems from experience of EAP professionals increasingly being expected to teach home students and Learning Development professionals being expected to provide targeted support for international students. We believe that the two teaching specialisms may be gradually merging, and that, in any case, we have much to learn by sharing areas of contrast and overlap in our remits, roles, and practices.

In constructing the programme for today, we decided not to have a plenary speaker in order to make space in the programme for more practitioners to present. The response to our Call for Papers was very strong, so we are sure that the day’s presentations, workshops, and discussions will prove stimulating and constructive.

Another feature of the conference is a slot offering the chance to join a discussion group after lunch. (An alternative, for anyone who would like to network on the move, and enjoy the campus, is a Walk and Talk time. Just join our student guides at the door.)

We will finish the day with a panel discussion, so please bring along your questions and comments.

We have tried to make today as paper- and plastic-free as we can; hence the digital programme.

Our student helpers will be wearing purple lanyards; please feel free to ask them for directions, etc.

Please visit the stands representing today’s exhibitors:
- Garnet
- Macmillan
- SAGE

Many thanks to SAGE for sponsoring our morning coffee break.

We hope you enjoy the day. Your feedback will be welcome!
The EBS Building
(Campus map: C4)
### EBS Foyer: Registration

#### Room 2.35
- **Michel Mason and Caroline Hawthorne**
  - University of Essex
  - Perspectives on academic writing: L1 and L2 student experiences within healthcare and hospitality foundation degree programmes

#### Room 2.40
- **Sian Lund and Aleya James**
  - Royal College of Art
  - ALL for one and one for ALL: Integrating EAP and Academic Literacies in a Graduate Diploma program

#### Room 2.45
- **Dave Rush**
  - University of Essex
  - EAP and Academic Skills: Idiot schoolmasters and troublesome knowledge

#### Room 2.46
- **Sharon McCulloch and Tania Horák**
  - University of Central Lancashire
  - Supporting students' academic writing: Investigating the range of practice and what influences it

#### Room 2.66
- **John Wríggleworth**
  - Sheffield Hallam University
  - Academic meaning-making as the common core of EAP and Learning Development

### Tea/Coffee break

#### Room 2.65
- **Sponsored by SAGE**

### Room 2.30
- **Simon Williams**
  - University of Sussex
  - The misted mirror: EAP and Academic Literacies approaches to teaching reflective writing

#### Room 2.40
- **Hannah Jones**
  - University of Bristol
  - EAP and Academic Literacies: A fuzzy boundary in the classroom

#### Room 2.45
- **Karen Matthewman and Conrad Heyns**
  - Goldsmiths, University of London
  - A tale of two centres: How two leaders of different academic centres within a single London University have worked together to support their students

#### Room 2.46
- **Olga Eva Rutkowska-Lis**
  - University of York
  - Academic Literacies and EAP: To box or not to box? Towards a lateral tutor’s approach [A practitioner’s perspective]

#### Room 2.66
- **Rosella D’Alesio**
  - Swansea University
  - Oracy as academic literacy learning from EAP!

### Room 2.65
- **John Sutter and Steve Dixon-Smith**
  - University for the Creative Arts
  - 5 years of ditching the distinctions: The story so far (Workshop)

### Lunch

#### Room 2.2
- **Maurice Abbott and Melissa Shales**
  - University of Essex
  - Disseminating student research (Discussion group)

#### Room 2.2
- **Liz Austin**
  - University of Essex
  - Student essay collection (Discussion group)

#### Room 2.2
- **Steve Briggs**
  - University of Bedfordshire
  - Evaluating practices (Discussion group)

### Room 2.30
- **Laryssa Whittaker and Stuart Wrigley**
  - Royal Holloway, University of London
  - Looking inwards: A meta-analysis of an academic writing journal

#### Room 2.40
- **Jonathan Randall and Sarah Macdonald**
  - University of the Arts, London
  - Literacies, language and student needs: An Arts, Design and Media context

#### Room 2.45
- **James Ackroyd**
  - GSM London
  - A case study of an “Academic Skills” course devised by EAP lecturers but part delivered by lecturers from other disciplines

#### Room 2.46
- **Paul Breen**
  - University of Westminster
  - More than talk around texts – incorporating knowledge and strategies into EAP and Academic Literacies teaching approaches

#### Room 2.66
- **Jayne Pearson**
  - King’s College London
  - Sites of struggle: Using an Academic Literacies framework to investigate EAP writing assessment practices

#### Room 2.65
- **Nadya Yakovchuk and Cathy Howard**
  - University of Surrey
  - Disciplinary collaborations: Clarifying remits and perceptions of EAP and Learning Development (Workshop)

### Tea/Coffee break

### Panel discussion

#### Room 2.2
- **Liz Austin**
- **Steve Briggs**
- **Tracey Costley**
- **Maxine Gillway**
The academisation of qualifications in the vocational areas of Healthcare and Hospitality, has led to an increasingly diverse university intake, prompting interest in the academic writing needs of students who ‘inhabit two life worlds’ (Strauss and Mooney, 2011, p.356). These students are typically from non-traditional academic backgrounds, and are combining the role of working professional with that of novice academic writer. As Academic Skills Tutors at the University of Essex, we draw on our knowledge of EAP and academic literacy approaches to shape language and academic literacy provision for L1 and L2 students. Some L2 students have undertaken English language courses in their own countries and in the UK, whereas L1 students may have experienced both school and post-compulsory English qualifications. Many have not received any academic literacy guidance since leaving school.

This paper explores L1 and L2 students’ perceptions of their language and literacy needs while studying on Healthcare and Hospitality foundation courses. It briefly considers their language learning backgrounds, before exploring individual student concerns about academic writing, and their views on different writing support strategies. Areas discussed range from students’ understanding of grammar and vocabulary to their experiences of feedback and different assignment types. Using the results from questionnaires and interviews, areas of convergence and divergence between L1 and L2 experiences are examined, and consideration given to whether writing support requires differentiation on the basis of first-language status. Finally, the paper considers implications of findings for future curriculum and pedagogical development.

Sian Lund and Aleya James
Royal College of Art

ALL for one and one for ALL: Integrating EAP and Academic Literacies in a Graduate Diploma program

10:10-10:40 Room 2.45

This talk gives an overview of the opportunities and challenges that come with designing a truly integrated model of content, language and learning in Art and Design Higher Education. We begin by reviewing the initial planning of embedded EAP support into the Graduate Diploma curriculum. However, as the first iteration of the course unfolded, our understanding of student learning needs has evolved concurrently. Initially housed within a ‘Learning Module’, the role of EAP support has subsequently morphed to incorporate a broader range of student needs reflecting a diversity within the student cohort impossible to predict beforehand.

We demonstrate and evaluate the on-going programme evolution in terms of:
1. Mapping Course Learning Outcomes to Academic Literacies in addition to EAP
2. Managing expectations: students and tutors
3. Division of Labour

We intend that our session, conceptualised as a reflective journey of an iterative professional practice will prompt/stimulate open discussion from the audience. We aim to provide: a forum for reflection; a space to share similar (or contrasting) issues; and a platform to debate the possibilities that programmes such as the Graduate Diploma afford us. Our hope is that our session will help us all approach the new dynamic of EAP/AL convergence in Higher Education with greater clarity and more plentiful creativity.

Sian has been the EAP coordinator at the RCA since 2015. She holds an MA in Applied Linguistics and is also working on research in the area of acculturation and cultural diversity in education.

Aleya spent the majority of her professional life working in the UAE and Oman. She holds an MA (TEFL) from Reading University and is currently working on her doctoral thesis. Her recent relocation to the UK has been immeasurably easier since she joined the RCA in July 2018!
In order to explore the institutional and pedagogical ground occupied, and the role played by those working in the professions of EAP and/or Academic Skills, this paper will explore key concepts which can be argued to provide both a shared basis for, and practical approach to teaching practice in both areas.

Ranciere’s work uses the life and career of French educator Joseph Jacotot to critique the deficit model that underpins many traditional pedagogical approaches, and instead build a more “emancipatory” method, which has many immediate and obvious similarities to common approaches in academic skills and EAP teaching. Meyer and Land, meanwhile, discuss discipline specific examples of “troublesome knowledge” that cause students to get “stuck”, and discuss how the notion of “threshold concepts” can be used to help learners progress beyond these.

Through an examination of how both these notions can be useful to, and diagnosed in, established practice, this paper will argue that they can be seen as an area of overlap, or shared ground between EAP and academic skills teaching, and can be used to help define and explain the purpose and utility of the two areas in HE.

Dave has a PhD in English Literature from the University of Sussex, and has taught in the UK, Nigeria and Sri Lanka.
English language provision in UK universities is often centralised and delivered via an English language unit or a so-called pathway provider like Study Group or INTO. Teachers often have ‘EAP tutor/lecturer’ as their job title, and teach a ‘common core’ of academic genres or skills to multi-disciplinary classes of international students. Such a model is by nature somewhat decontextualized and arguably underpinned mainly by an autonomous model of literacy (Street, 2006). Learning developers, on the other hand, often work with students on a one-to-one basis or with classes embedded within disciplinary programmes, a model of working which is more closely aligned with an academic literacies paradigm in which writing is seen as a social practice tied to issues of identity and cultural capital (Murray, 2016).

What is not known is the extent to which these different contexts inform the way, on the one hand, EAP teachers and, on the other, learning developers conceptualise academic writing. EAP teachers, by virtue of their professional training and the contexts within which they work, may tend to conceptualise academic writing in terms of a mainly autonomous model of literacy, drawing to a limited extent on academic literacies concepts.

This talk reports on a small research project in which EAP teachers and learning developers at 2 UK universities were interviewed about their views on what academic writing is and what their students need, with a view to understanding whether a new perspective may enhance the practice of both groups.

*Sharon has worked as an EAP lecturer and a learning developer. Her research interests lie mainly in academic writing practices and how institutional and social contexts affect writers.*

*Tania has worked in EFL, EAP and EFL teacher training programmes both in the UK and abroad. Her research interests lie in foreign language testing and assessment, above all washback, impact and social consequences of exams.*
Learning Development and EAP practitioners share a commitment to empowering students to meet their learning objectives. Both recognize that students can be empowered by improving their control over the meaning-making resources of language. Twenty years of academic literacy research has moved the approach from recognizing the challenges surrounding academic literacy (see for example, Lillis & Scott, 2007) to contributing concrete suggestions for change (such as the case studies in Lillis, Harrington, Lea and Mitchell, 2015). Similarly, EAP research has developed a finer-grained target situation analysis from its early days as a branch of ESAP, as outlined by Jordan (1997), through to understandings of disciplinary discourses (for example, Hyland, 2004) and of academic practices. Thus, we have seen a steady, though non-linear, evolution in academic ‘languaging’ (described by Turner, 2011). Wingate and Tribble (2011) see the potential to draw on both approaches and offer “a model of discipline-specific, integrated writing instruction” that can generate transformative writing support programmes.

Grounded in this work, the presentation discusses two approaches to teaching academic writing to UK undergraduates. The first approach has a primary objective of teaching students to take an exploratory approach to academic genre, register, and grammar using a variety of texts. The second approach prioritises teaching content using texts taken from the students’ target discipline and developing literacy skills within particular pedagogic tasks.

The discussion will help to unpick how the university system works, how students are assessed, and how students can be given control (empowered) of the meaning making resources they need to succeed at university.


John is a Principal Lecturer at Sheffield Hallam University. He teaches on the TESOL Centre’s pre-sessional and International Foundation Programmes. His research interests include academic literacies, EAP and task-based learning.
Simon Williams
University of Sussex

The misted mirror: EAP and Academic Literacies approaches to teaching reflective writing

11:10-11:40 Room 2.35

The increasingly common requirement for university students to produce a piece of reflective writing as contributory assessment often results in an expression of the writer's self that is neither convincing nor focused. Such problematic academic writer identity is understood differently by researchers in EAP and Academic Literacies. Arguing from an Academic Literacies perspective, Ivanic (1998) theorises three aspects of self-representation in writing: autobiography, discourse and author self. She adopts a discoursal interpretation of writer identity, derived from the double-voicing and intertextuality of Bakhtin and Fairclough respectively. Here, the writer assumes the verbal accessories of the discourse community to claim authenticity.

Adopting an EAP perspective, Hyland (2002) in his study of authorial identity in academic writing, explores the third of Ivanic's (1998) three constructs, the author self. Through an analysis of the first person pronoun, Hyland assesses ‘the extent to which a writer intrudes into a text’ (Hyland, 2002: 1092) to accomplish a range of writerly functions such as stating their goal.

It is broadly Hyland’s (2002) form-based understanding of writer identity that underlies Lehman’s (2018) study of authorial voice. Despite her approval of Ivanič (1998) and other academic literacies authors, Lehman (2018) notes that the academy privileges the essay genres of exposition, description, and argumentation over first person narration such as that typical of reflective writing. Yet it is the practice of first person narration, facilitated by the Academic Literacies approach, rather than the honing of specific formal features, that best prepares novice student writers for success in the genre.


Simon is a Tutorial Fellow in ELT, interested in all forms of academic discourse and in discourse and identity more generally. He is also interested in experimental methods in language acquisition research.
Hannah Jones
University of Bristol
EAP and Academic Literacies: A fuzzy boundary in the classroom

11:10-11:40 Room 2.40

This presentation will begin by sharing the principles and processes that underlie the ALL (academic language and literacy) provision at the University of Bristol, and how we design our courses in collaboration with the disciplines. I will look, with specific reference to both the literature and our in-house materials, at how academic literacies approaches have informed the development of our provision and will share the ways in which we differentiate ALL from EAP in our communications with the university.

Academic literacies researchers, however, have noted the lack of pedagogic solutions to the issues they have documented so well, and I would argue that the EAP tool-box is one good place to start looking for answers to this question. In the classroom, as practitioners differentiate to meet the needs of diverse students within and across mixed groups, the boundaries between AL and EAP become fuzzy. Through an analysis of activities in our classroom materials, I will argue that, particularly as EAP develops as a discipline, it becomes less important to distinguish between the two. Of more importance is the need to use classroom assessment techniques to understand the people in the room, and choose the most appropriate approaches and activities to facilitate their learning.

Hannah coordinates discipline-specific academic language and literacy provisions for all PGT students, home and international, at the University of Bristol. Her interests are internationalisation, academic literacies and curriculum embedding.
Karen Matthewman and Conrad Heyns  
Goldsmiths, University of London  

A tale of two centres: How two leaders of different academic centres within a single London University have worked together to support their students

11:10-11:40 Room 2.45

At Goldsmiths, what was previously a single Centre for English Language and Academic Writing (CELAW) was split into two centres. The Academic Skills Centre was then conceived and relocated as a separate academic unit under the umbrella of Library Services. Existing Goldsmiths staff were gathered within this centre: a few EAP lecturers previously in CELAW, along with study support tutors and the Peer Assisted Learning (PAL) scheme coordinator. The English Language Centre continued to offer Insessional support as well as credit-bearing courses aimed at students whose first language is not English.

As the two centre leaders appointed after this change, we will not be looking at the possible causes of this restructure, but will be discussing the opportunities and challenges that have resulted along the way. We will explore our shared beliefs about learning and teaching and our common EAP backgrounds, while recognising that both centres need to have distinct goals and identities effectively communicated to the institution.

Goldsmiths has a diverse student body and high numbers of students with specialist learning needs and non-traditional backgrounds. This makes it both a wonderful place to work as well as very challenging in terms of meeting the level of need that arises.

We have tried to be collaborative and research-driven in our approach as we situate ourselves within the institution. We are attempting to embrace other research areas, ways of working and communities of practice in order to have a greater impact on the learning and teaching practices of Goldsmiths and beyond.

Karen is a Senior Fellow of the HEA and has worked in HE for over 25 years. Prior to that she taught EFL and EAP in Japan, Spain and the Czech Republic. She is Head of Academic Skills and leads the Academic Skills Centre at Goldsmiths.

Conrad has taught at home and around the world in the private sector and HE. He chairs the BALEAP Accreditation Scheme, and is an Eaquals and IH World Organisation inspector. His interests include quality assurance and the student experience. He is the Head of the ELC at Goldsmiths.
In the UK, Academic Literacies slowly crept into researchers’ framework together with the New Labour’s meritocratic vision of education (as put forward in their White Paper, 1997 and perceiving education as a commodity and means to an end). Changing socio-economic situation (together with other aspects) put new strain on the government that drew heavily on the US example.

The short history of the academic literacies perspective (from Lea and Street (1998) accusing the study skills approach to be a static one, through Lillis & Scott (2007) textual ‘identify and induct’ approach to Wingate & Tribble’s (2012) amalgamation proposal seems a rather turbulent one. And fascinating as these deliberations might be, they resemble a chicken and egg situation, a conundrum most practitioners simply have very little (if any) time for consideration. After all, a practitioner’s time tends to be pre-occupied with teaching and research (alas, largely practice-based). It should perhaps be emphasized at this point that there is considerable value in research and in having the means to ponder upon what is practised by looking back to theoretical frameworks. Still, it would seem that basing one’s approach on first-hand-experience is of equal value. Hence the proposed call to, if not quit labelling, then at least allow for a large margin to include variety.

This paper aims to illustrate the validity of such an attitude by sharing academic practice using International Pathway Foundation courses (as offered by the University of York) as an example.

Olga is an educationist with an interest in Education Studies and Sociology of Education, TESOL, and SEN. She is a psycholinguist and lecturer in General Linguistics and Phonetics & Phonology; and an EAP and Study Skills Tutor.
Excellent communication skills are frequently listed as desirable requisites by employers across all sectors globally. Yet, in both EAP and HE generally, speaking skills have been the poor relation of writing and reading despite the fact that many students have to demonstrate their oral ability in seminars, group work and presentations. In many pre-sessional and English for University courses, the teaching of speaking tends to concentrate on how to deliver a presentation, pronunciation and audience awareness and even this, arguably scant preparation, seems to give them an advantage over domestic students who do not have this training.

Using my personal experience, I wish to compare how speaking skills are taught and where lessons lie. For the last three years, I have taught both domestic students and students for whom the first language is not English, in a credit-bearing module entitled ‘Public Speaking’ for the school of management at Swansea University. Doing so, I have become acutely aware of how badly even most domestic students need training in oral skills and how this need is not always addressed in schools or HE. In fact, there is growing recognition nationally that oracy skills need to be targeted more assiduously. Having taught EAP for many years, it is interesting to discover what can be learnt from EAP but also how, in the guise of academic literacies, learning from EAP, oracy can be broken down into the discrete skills that need to be taught and practiced so that oral ability flourishes.

Rosella is Programme Director with the Centre for Academic Success at Swansea University. She is interested in the teaching of English for Academic Purposes and ways of offering enhanced in-sessional support.
This workshop will relate and reflect on the merging of two separate teams and roles - EAP and ‘Study Skills’ - into a new team of Learning Development Tutors, during a major departmental restructure in 2013. We will consider and reflect on the different perceptions and experiences of team members, their interpretation of both old and new roles, how ‘academic literacies’ and ‘EAP’ are understood as different or similar ‘approaches’, and also the understandings of the broader academic community. We will frame some of the discussion in terms of how the neoliberal university responds to different agendas that it sees as important, and how these agendas position members of the learning development community, be they from EAP or academic literacies or study skills backgrounds. We will relate how we have found that even within the two specialisms, there are major differences in terms of how ‘EAP’, ‘study skills’, ‘learning development’ etc. are understood, and how the names also provoke a very broad range of discourses within the university as a whole. We will also, using a case study, describe how more recent critical and collaborative work with academic subject tutors and student have begun to suggest emerging practices which in some ways challenge the ‘traditional’ functions and approaches of both EAP/Academic Literacies. There will be opportunities for participants to discuss and relate their own experiences to what we have found over the last 5 years.

John is Learning Enhancement and Support Manager at the University for the Creative Arts in Canterbury, where he leads on language and learning development. He has worked in education for over 25 years in the UK and abroad, initially in EFL/ESOL and then as a teacher trainer and educational consultant, including seven years as part of the nationally renowned team at LLU+, London South Bank University.

Steve is a Learning Development Tutor at the University for the Creative Arts. He is also an ESRC-funded Doctoral Researcher in Educational Studies at Goldsmiths, University of London. His research and practice take a critical sociolinguistic approach to questions of identities and social justice in HE. He has worked as an EAP tutor and Learning Developer across a range of HE contexts for over 10 years.
In 2007, while employed as the resident writing consultant at a department of the Copenhagen Business School (ca. 20,000 students), I began a collaboration with the library to deliver an integrated package of services to the teaching programs and doctoral schools, which would support students at all levels in learning “the craft of research”. This eventually led to moving the position to the library, allowing it to spread to the entire university, supported by the Teaching & Learning unit and gaining traction also in the design of assignments and setting of academic standards.

In this talk, I will share experiences from this attempt to support the increasingly important work of fostering strong academic literacy skills among our students. Our program explicitly engages with both traditional writing process (and post-process) approaches, as well as the new thinking within AL (Lea & Street) and EAP (Ding & Bruce) to articulate an “inframethodology”: an account of the underlying craft of research. Scholarly writing is the art of writing down what you know for the purpose of discussing it with other knowledgeable people, and we provide an framework within which students learn how to compose paragraphs and arrange them into arguments, while helping them to situate these arguments within the literature of their discipline. The library lends itself naturally as a site for this work, while working in a bilingual (English/Danish) environment, the connections between AL and EAP are never far from view.

Thomas Basbøll
Copenhagen Business School Library
Inframethodology: The underlying craft of research
11:50-12:20 Room 2.35

Thomas is the resident writing consultant at the Copenhagen Business School Library. With a background in the philosophy of science (MA, 1999; PhD, 2004), Thomas has been working for about a decade helping students and researchers master the craft beneath the method of research. He calls his approach Writing Process Reengineering and blogs about it at blog.cbs.dk/inframethodology.
I will present a new and so far successful example of how our university-wide Skills and Learning Development team and EAP Language Centre practitioners have collaborated over the past two years to provide institution-wide provision for all students across the university, regardless of their English language profile. From September 2018 we will be jointly delivering a programme of 152 workshops to approximately 4000 students across 8 faculties.

Our collaboration is a result of an identified need to break down the 'silos' of 'international' and 'home' student (terms which we feel are in fact inaccurate and unhelpful) and to remove the deficit model and replace it with the developmental need of all students to acquire and hone academic literacy, voice and identity.

I will also discuss briefly the wider positive results of our collaboration within both the Skills and Language teams and across the institution in terms of developing muscular ways of actualising an academic literacies lens and developing the opportunities for dialogue and more flexible perceptions of the literacy resources students bring with them.

Anika is an experienced learning developer, and was recently awarded recognition as an ALDinHE Certified Practitioner.
It is widely acknowledged that many home and international students at different levels of study experience difficulty with academic writing, particularly when starting a text. For example, Murray and Moore (2006) report students encountering barriers to starting writing who describe the ‘agonies of just getting down to it’ (p.29). This experience, often referred to as writer’s block, can be caused by problems with academic language, academic conventions and practices, and time management. As these problems are located within academic literacy and EAP, students experiencing these difficulties turn to, or are directed towards, learning support staff and EAP practitioners. This session discusses how staff in these roles may be able to support students to overcome writer’s block.

Firstly, students often struggle to find appropriate academic words to start writing which can cause them to procrastinate. By getting them to understand the rhetorical moves of a research paper (Swales and Feak, 2012) and teaching sentence stems from a set of useful formulaic phrases (for example, Academic Phrasebank), supporting staff can empower students with language and structure to begin writing. Secondly, difficulties with mastering academic conventions can be addressed through workshops facilitating discussion of acceptable and unacceptable practice (Davis, 2007), and pedagogical interventions which demystify the academic writing process and product (Farrell and Tighe-Mooney, 2013). Thirdly, management of the time needed for research, reading and writing tends to be problematic for all academic writers. A useful approach is to encourage students to work productively in short and longer periods (Murray and Moore, 2006).


Mary is a Senior Lecturer at Oxford Brookes University where she runs Pre-Master’s programmes for international and home students. Her research interests focus on academic writing, phraseology and academic integrity.
Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956) was originally developed as an educational development tool to be used in defining learning objectives, validating assessment and developing curricula. It has since been appropriated by both Learning Developers and EAP professionals and used directly with students in the classroom.

With both groups of practitioners increasingly sharing students, this mutual use of Bloom has implications for student engagement, the allocation of academic support services and the general integrity of these disciplines. On the positive side, this sharing of resources presents an opportunity for student-centred collaboration and the development of a holistic pedagogy of learner enablement.

This research will compare and contrast Learning Developers and EAP professionals’ use of Bloom’s Taxonomy in their respective classrooms. An online self-completion questionnaire will be administered to teachers at 3 universities with clearly distinct EAP and LD departments (Aston, Lancaster and UAL). It will capture awareness, usage and attitude towards Bloom’s Taxonomy through a mix of open and prompted questions, covering:

1. Depth of knowledge
2. Learning objectives
3. Pedagogic activities
4. Assessment

A workshop format is proposed, with a debrief of survey results preceded by an interactive collaboration between Learning Developer and EAP professional attendees to collect data for comparison with survey results.

Learning Development is Olu’s third career, following twenty years in market research and English Language teaching. Olu is also a PhD candidate at Birmingham, researching the use of linguistics for deception detection.
Since the 1980s many universities in the English-speaking world sought and saw an increase in international students as a lucrative revenue stream. Many of these students lacked, and still lack sufficient competence in English academic conventions to function well in higher education (HE). EAP came into existence to remedy such deficiencies. EAP is a form of ESP (Johns, 1974), and until recently has been seen from a “Study Skills” perspective which engages in debates about good or bad writing—i.e. the deficit models (Lea & Street, 1998). This contrasts with the Academic Literacies (AL) perspective, which considers writing in academic contexts, such as university courses, at the level of epistemology. From the student’s view-point, a dominant feature of AL is the requirement to switch writing styles and genres according to the particular disciplinary requirements in terms of argumentation, genre, rhetorical styles, as well as handling the social meanings and identities that each discipline evokes. Because AL treat reading and writing as social practices that vary with context, culture, and genre (Street, 1995) across fields and disciplines, they best encapsulate the purpose of HE: of being open to challenging perceived wisdom. AL potentially can give recognition to the overseas student’s different academic epistemological background and prevent her from being seen through a ‘deficit’ lens that can lead to cultural misconceptions, perpetuate stereotypes, and at its extreme a ‘silencing’ of the student’s voice. AL can help enrich our academic lexicon by incorporating aspects of other academic traditions and bridge the cultural gap.

Qasir is an English language teacher of 19 years’ experience, the last four in EAP. He is also a part-time PhD student studying Philosophy of Education at UCL.
Discussion groups 13:30-14:10

Maurice Abbott and Melissa Shales University of Essex
Disseminating Student Research Room 2.46

This is a networking event for anyone interested in the publication and dissemination of student work. The session will start with a brief presentation of the Essex student-led, peer-reviewed academic journal ESTRO. This will be followed by a chance for participants to discuss how student work is disseminated in other institutions. Finally, we will attempt to explore possible areas in which institutions could collaborate in this field.

Maurice is an academic skills tutor in the TDC and a Course Director in Essex Pathways. He is interested in skills development for international Postgraduate students. He also supervises ESTRO, the University’s student-led journal.

Melissa is a Creative Writing PhD Student at the University of Essex and current editor of the university’s student journal, ESTRO; professionally she is a travel writer, editor, ESOL teacher and GTA.

Liz Austin University of Essex
Student essay collection Room 2.66

The Talent Development Centre has recently received a grant to compile an online collection of student writing. It is envisaged that the collection will form an independent study resource for students, a teaching resource for TDC department-embedded skills sessions, and a materials resource for wider University staff training on topics such as principles of constructive feedback. We welcome the opportunity to share our plans and current progress with anyone who already works with such a collection, or who might also be interested in establishing their own.

Liz is Head of the Talent Development Centre (Taught Programmes) at the University of Essex. Her main interests are in academic literacies, writing within the curriculum and collaborative programme design.

Steve Briggs University of Bedfordshire
Evaluating practices Room 2.65

Historically, there has been limited cross-institutional consistency in how academic language / learning development teams present evaluation outcomes. This makes it hard to meaningfully compare results and triangulate impact assessment. To address this, the International Consortium of Academic Language and Learning Development (ICALLD) are developing an evaluation framework which it is hoped will be adopted by institutions in the UK, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. This session will introduce the ICALLD evaluation framework. Attendees are invited to discuss the applicability of the framework to their teaching and share other evaluation strategies.

Steve is Co-Chair of ALDinHE and Head of Professional and Academic Development at the University of Bedfordshire. Steve is a Chartered Psychologist and a SFHEA.
Scholarship and research on academic writing takes in a wide variety of research traditions, from Learning Development, EAP, Academic Literacies through to Education Studies, Linguistics, and Rhetoric and Composition, and quite probably more besides. We suggest that it is this variety of theoretical and methodological traditions underpinning Academic Writing, and the intersection of scholarship and research, that has prevented it from becoming a fully-fledged academic discipline. It is this hypothesis we wish to explore in our talk, via a meta-analysis of one particular academic writing journal. The following questions will be addressed: what intellectual traditions are being drawn upon by contributors to the journal? Who is citing whom? How does this relate to the institutional positioning of contributors? The talk contributes to other ‘meta-studies’, most notably Driscoll and Perdue’s (2012) study of The Writing Center Journal, and Hewings, Lillis and Vladimirou’s (2010) study of citation practices in psychology journals. Our talk combines a similar focus on writing research to Driscoll and Perdue (2012) with a meta-analysis that is broader (though not as extensive) than Hewings, Lillis and Vladimirou (2010), to produce (we hope) some fresh insights into the development of disciplinary communities. We also present an adaptation of Haswell’s (2005) ‘RAD model’ for evaluating research papers as a catalyst for contextualising the role of research and scholarship in our interlinked disciplines.


Laryssa and Stuart are both Teaching Fellows in the Centre for the Development of Academic Skills at Royal Holloway, University of London. They were on the organising committee of the European Association for Teaching Academic Writing (EATAW) conference held in 2017, at which Stuart was elected to the EATAW board. He now serves as its Deputy Chair. Together they have co-edited a forthcoming special issue of EATAW conference proceeds for the Journal of Academic Writing.
How are literacies different within an Arts, Design and Media context? UAL is a somewhat sprawling institution spread out over six colleges all with eclectic ways of approaching the written word often originating from anti-structuralist paradigms. On top of this are a student cohort who are largely creative practitioners, many with different academic backgrounds, 50% of whom are now international. In these contexts, inevitably the demands placed on Support Services are multiple. The various service providers are aware of significant areas of commonality regarding students’ language and learning development needs and questions have arisen about the difference between Academic Support and Language Development in particular. Students and Course Leaders also get us mixed up, which, in a sense, is no bad thing – we are all there to enable students to do their best - but our skill sets can often be quite different.

This presentation will explore the differences and similarities in our work, the lenses through which we teach and conclude with strategies that are in place to foster more collaboration. Certainly, for Language Development it is difficult to teach language without a context and context requires literacy. In the same way, despite branching out into a more holistic approach involving the identity of the student and their wellbeing, Academic Support at UAL is unavoidably immersed in language. The answer is not to impose boundaries on each, but to encourage better collaboration and a shared programme of co-delivered events.

Sarah is an Academic Support Lecturer at London College of Communication, UAL. She supports students in tutorials, facilitates embedded sessions and collaborates with colleagues to run lunchtime workshops, a cross-cultural discussion group and creative writing sessions.

Jon is currently Acting Head of Language Development at The University of Arts London where he has worked for the past 13 years.
This case study is based upon research done into student and staff perceptions of a mandatory “Academic skills” course and observations of classes given on the course.

The course is run at GSM London one of the largest alternative providers of HE in the country. Retention and progression of Foundation and 1st year students is an issue and a series of “skills” courses at foundation and 1st and 2nd year have been introduced as part of a wider strategy put forward to the Office for Students to target this. The cohort of students for the “Academic Skills” course is generally around 400 – 600 students. The students come from a wide range of backgrounds, with a particularly high proportion of BAME and mature students. The main focus will be about how successfully a course run across academic departments with the support of the academic departments in terms of timetabled hours can be in delivering subject specific academic skills taking into account Hyland’s supposition that each academic subject has its own set of literacies.

It will focus primarily on the inter-relationship of teaching staff in the CFLS and academic departments and how this relationship helped or hindered student learning. This will be divided into 2 sections. Firstly, how successful a “generic” lecture can be in allowing students to develop the required academic literacies needed for their discipline. Secondly, how far subject specialists own identity and expertise as university lecturers in their chosen field affects their teaching of an academic skills course.

The conclusion reached is that the model of an academic skills course as taught at GSM can be successful. However, this success is reliant on the “buy in” of the whole academic faculty and it is vital that there is engagement from all parties involved. If this is in place, such a course is an essential part of an integrated institute wide strategy to improve success and retention.

James has been teaching EAP and ESOL for over 20 years in the UK and abroad. He is currently a programme leader for foundation and skills at GSM London. His research interests include developing EAP skills for widening participation students.
This is a presentation that looks at the contribution EAP can make to the shaping or re-shaping of Academic Literacies approaches within the changing context of contemporary HE institutions. Historically, EAP teaching has been positioned on the margins of HE institutions but in recent times has moved towards playing a greater part. Expectations around EAP still differ though across contexts.

Within the Academic Literacies literature, going back to Lea & Street’s seminal (1998) article, there has been a depiction of three models of learning – ‘study skills’, ‘academic socialisation’ and ‘academic literacies.’

When implemented properly, with the right level of student and suitably prepared teachers, the Literacies approach works very well. However, my argument is that there are a number of pitfalls which occur. This presentation will highlight these and the measures that can be taken to address them.

In summary, these pitfalls can be listed as:

a) Teachers’ lack of awareness of what the Academic Literacies approach actually entails – contributed to by developmental background of practitioners.

b) Challenges of a context that demands study skills and socialisation in some form, because this is what other departments expect EAP to provide.

c) Failure of institutions to create environments where a proper teaching and developmental culture can exist. Hiring done on an ad hoc sessional basis, with many freelancers who have lived on the margins of the academy for decades – one year of experience repeated 20 times. Doesn’t lend itself to fostering the existence of a subject or institutional teaching vision.

d) Reduction of Literacies to what I would label as a talk-around-texts approach without incorporation of the necessary strategies and knowledge to unpack these texts. Effectively the creation of a domain where no teaching takes place.

Having highlighted these issues I will then suggest that they can be dealt with in the following manner:

1) Clear understanding of what Academic Literacies involves and a need to incorporate the skills and socialisation aspects not under those names, but under the banner of strategy. To do this teachers themselves need a strong foundation of strategic knowledge as defined by Lee Shulman and others.

2) Creation of a context that lends itself to supporting the depth of knowledge required of practitioners in an EAP context that aspires to fostering Academic Literacy in students. The present environment in many institutions is simply designed to facilitate a deficit model of EAP teaching.

Paul is a Senior Lecturer in the University of Westminster, currently teaching and managing on a range of EAP, TESOL and Academic Practice courses. His PhD in Education focused on a study of developments in the practice of EAP teachers in the aftermath of a teacher education programme on the integration of new technologies with traditional language teaching pedagogy. He has also published in this area and on issues related to language, culture and identity.
Academic Literacies, as a critical approach, contributes to the teaching of EAP through the notions of problematizing power and meaning-making within disciplinary discourses (Lea and Street, 1998; Lea et al, 2010). However, there is a dearth of studies within this framework on the impacts of the high-stakes summative assessment on EAP courses, which can be said to limit the potential for meaningful pedagogical applications of this critical approach.

The avocation by academic literacies pedagogy to demystify the expectations of the academy (Zamel, 1997; Lillis, 2003) can be seen as impeded by the economic, political and ideological constraints of current EAP assessment practices. This culminates in a focus on the product at the expense of the process of written discourse, and reinforces powerlessness around assessment. Within the institutional EAP context, assessment is “done to” or “performed on” students (Boud, 2000: 156), constraining “the organising, controlling and evaluating of one’s experience” (Van Leir, 1996: 73) on the part of students, a prerequisite of agency and understanding of one’s interpersonal, intrapersonal and discoursal identity.

This paper will report on the implementation of an alternative assessment, termed processfolio, to foster agency and the ability of students to conceptualise themselves as developing academic writers within the constraints of current EAP assessment practices (Pearson, 2017). The processfolio was designed to align the practice of writing assessment with an Academic Literacies critical framework for transformation.

Jayne has been an EAP lecturer for ten years. Her research focuses on assessment impact. She has recently transitioned into Educational Development, where she uses EAP-derived pedagogies in supporting academics across faculties to implement student-centred approaches and assessment for learning within their disciplines.
Although EAP and Learning Development at the University of Surrey constitute two distinct services, our remits may not always be clear to the academic departments we work with. In order to provide more targeted support to disciplines and clarify any misconceptions that might exist, we carried out a pilot survey of how the areas of EAP and Learning Development are understood at our institution by targeting three participant groups: EAP practitioners, Learning Developers and academics in one academic School. This workshop will contextualise the EAP and Learning Development provision at the University of Surrey and will invite participants to answer a selection of questions from this survey. After discussing the audience’s responses, we will share the findings of our survey and ponder their implications for EAP and Learning Development provision in the changing university environment.

*With a background in applied linguistics and EAP, Nadya has been working in Learning Development for the last 6 years. Her interests include disciplinary writing, authorial stance and writer identity.*

*Cathy has been working in English for Academic Purposes since 2009. She has a background in supporting ESL students in Further and Higher Education and in English Language teacher education.*
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