

Cover Sheet for Proposals <i>(All sections must be completed)</i>		JISC e-Learning Programme	
Name of Call Area Bidding For (tick ONE only):			
Call I: Transforming Curriculum Delivery Through Technology (JISC funded)			✓
Call I: Transforming Curriculum Delivery Through Technology (Becta funded)			
Call II: Assessment demonstrators			
Call III: Course description and discovery			
Name of Lead Institution: Coventry University			
Name of Proposed Project: COWL: Coventry Online Writing Laboratory			
Name(s) of Project Partner(s):			
Full Contact Details for Primary Contact:			
Name:	David Morris		
Position:	Director of Higher Education Development		
Email:	d.morris@coventry.ac.uk		
Address:	Coventry University Priory Street Coventry CV1 5FB		
Tel:	07974 984023		
Fax:	024 7679 2301		
Length of Project:	Two years		
Project Start Date:	1 October 2008	Project End Date:	30 September 2010
Total Funding Requested from JISC: £196,404			
Funding Broken Down over Financial Years (April - March):			
April 08 – March 09	April 09 – March 10	April 10 – March 11	
£91,142	£74,798	£30,464	
Total Institutional Contributions: £130,937			
Outline Project Description			
<p>The project is organised into three main phases. The first three months will comprise a project definition phase during which current practice at Coventry and elsewhere will be reviewed in order to establish a baseline against which project impact can be evaluated. This will allow us to refine and clarify the project vision and complete a full project plan for ourselves and JISC.</p> <p>The second phase will comprise a pilot implementation of the new curriculum delivery approach in two areas of the university: paramedic science and economics. These two groups of students represent “extremes” of the contexts in which learners find themselves. The paramedic students are in a highly mobile, work-based situation, studying online with relatively</p>			

little attendance at the university. Many are mature students. The students are also highly dispersed. However the professional standards they are required to meet lay emphasis on clear communication in all forms, including writing. The economists are predominantly full-time students studying face-to-face and in the 18-23 age bracket.

In the third phase we will commence implementation of the curriculum delivery system which has been improved in the light of results from the pilot phase. The implementation will be across all appropriate areas of CAW's work.

I have looked at the example FOI form at Appendix B and included an FOI form in the attached bid (Tick Box)	YES ✓	NO
I have read the Circular and associated Terms and Conditions of Grant at Appendix D (Tick Box)	YES ✓	NO

1. Introduction

1.1 Academic writing is a primary way through which students learn and a primary way through which students are assessed in higher education. Over the last two decades, partly as a result of the “massification” and internationalisation of HE and the need to provide skills support to a more diverse student body, there has been increasing attention paid to the teaching and researching of student writing in UK HE.¹ There is now a broad recognition that university students need to be taught to write; for example, an Autumn 2000 national survey of staff perspectives on the teaching of academic writing in higher education found that 90% of respondents believe it is now necessary to teach writing to university students (Ganobcsik-Williams, 2004)².

1.2 However, with the exception of providing support for students to understand what is meant by, and therefore avoid committing, plagiarism³, as far as we know, little systematic work has been done in the area of online academic writing support in UK higher education. Existing activity focuses on electronic resources like grammar quizzes (e.g. the “Writing Menagerie” diagnostic writing tool for students at Nottingham Trent University) and writing guidance handouts (e.g. the “resources” webpage at London Metropolitan University’s writing centre⁴). While these resources are noteworthy, possibilities such as synchronous online writing tutoring, for example, do not yet feature strongly.

1.3 A key challenge faced by universities in the 21st century is the need to make writing support appropriate to a more flexible learning and teaching environment. Even as universities have begun to address the current demand for student writing support, it is clear that university managers and academics will have to consider how this provision is going to be made available to meet the requirements of a very different type of learner. Support for learning will have to be provided in ways that can be accessed at the point of need by students who are geographically dispersed and studying at different times. In the US many institutions have moved towards online writing support. In short universities need to transform the delivery of academic writing support through technology in order to reach and help all student groups.

2. What is an “online writing laboratory” (OWL)?

2.1 Online writing support, and in particular, online tutoring in writing is more advanced in the US than in Europe and more advanced in some European countries than in the UK. There is a long tradition of teaching writing in US universities and colleges, and writing centres have been in place in most institutions across the sector since the 1970s. A new form or extension of physical writing centres is the “online writing lab” or “OWL” (sometimes referred to as an online writing centre), the first was established at Purdue University in 1993⁵.

¹ Academic writing emerged as a teaching and research specialism in UK higher education from the early 1990s (see, for example, Ganobcsik-Williams, L. ed. (2006) *Teaching Academic Writing in UK Higher Education: Theories, Practices and Models*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan). The Academic Literacies Research Group (AcLits) Writing Development in Higher Education (WDHE) network, and other organisations give researchers and practitioners opportunities to discuss student writing from a range of disciplinary perspectives and to contribute to international developments in the teaching of writing. These organisations share links with the three main European organisations that study university-level writing: the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW), the European Writing Centers Association (EWCA), and the European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction Special Interest Group (EARLI-SIG Writing).

² Ganobcsik-Williams, L (2004). *A Report on the Teaching of Academic Writing in UK Higher Education*, London: Royal Literary Fund.

³ The JISC sponsored publication *Plagiarism: a good practice guide* recommends compulsory academic writing tuition for students to help them recognise and avoid plagiarism. See page 18 of:

<http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/plagiarism/brookes.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.londonmet.ac.uk/depts/dops/writing-centre/resources.cfm>

⁵ We will investigate the possibilities of adapting tools developed by US OWL's, for example the “cybertutorials” developed at Missouri (<https://web.missouri.edu/~umcaswritery/>), use of Skype and podcasts at Bowling Green State University (<http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/acen/writingctr/page29898.html>) and online writing consultations at Denver (<http://thunder1.cudenver.edu/writing/onlineConsultations.html>)

2.2 Whilst it is probably more productive to think in terms of technology enhanced learning environments (TELEs) rather than online ones, and a TELE would be a much more accurate term for the learning and teaching environment this project is aiming to create, OWL is an established and recognisable name internationally and there are some merits in retaining it pro tem, even if it gives misleading signals as to the scope of activity embraced by the proposed project.

3. Coventry University's Experience

3.1 In October 2004, the new Centre for Academic Writing at Coventry University, the first of its kind in UK HE, opened to students seeking guidance on writing essays, reports, dissertations and other types of academic prose. Prior to CAW's establishment, ad hoc advice on student writing was given by a number of agencies including the library, the disabilities office, the dyslexia support unit, the English language unit and faculty staff. However, none of these groups were set up to provide systematic, professional and easily accessible support as an entitlement. CAW offers various forms of support, including one-to-one consultations, group workshops, and paper-based and electronic materials on topics ranging from how to construct an academic argument to how to improve grammar and sentence structure. CAW also helps student writers by working with faculty-based academic staff to design and implement effective writing assignments within subject courses⁶. CAW recognizes the unprecedented diversity of Academic Writing tasks and that all students can benefit from writing support because all forms of HE writing are shaped by very different conventions and expectations from those of other (including school) modes of writing⁷.

3.2 CAW is an innovative teaching and research centre whose mission is to enable students at Coventry University to become independent writers and to equip academic staff in all disciplines to achieve their full potential as authors and teachers of scholarly writing. CAW has a full-time staff of seven, including a full-time learning technologist, and a team of six academic writing tutors. In 2007 the centre moved to a modern, high-quality dedicated space next to the library. A significant investment is being made in Summer 2008 to re-equip the centre with wireless access, laptops, new display screens and furniture to provide a flexible environment for group teaching and one in which students can choose whether to use their own computing devices or the centre's.

3.3 Since Autumn 2007 CAW has been organisationally located within the Centre for the Study of in Higher Education (CSHE). CSHE brings together CAW, the e-Learning Unit (eLU), the Applied Research Centre in learning and teaching and the university's academic staff development unit. This structure provides a valuable opportunity, incentive and the capability to expand academic writing activities beyond delivery to students and to offer staff development to academics in teaching discipline-specific writing. CAW's position within the institution thus facilitates development and research of student writing across the disciplines and makes it unique among UK universities.

3.4 CAW staff have researched the teaching and tutoring of Academic Writing internationally, including evaluating the effective use of technologies, CAW is now in a position to apply and develop the Centre's experience to the benefit of Coventry University's students and the UK HE sector as a whole.

4. What is "academic writing?"

4.1 Today's HE students are expected to master an array of written genres.⁸ The term "academic writing" encompasses the wide variety of writing genres required of students, and includes profession-orientated assignments as well as more traditional academic assignments such as essays and dissertations. CAW recognises that the goals for teaching writing explicitly at university level are to enable students understand and practice writing as a process that is closely

⁶ CAW has developed a series of linked projects with faculty staff (Academic Writing in the Disciplines) to recognise and develop subject-specific writing needs.

⁷ CAW's main pedagogic model (the traditional writing centre model) is that CAW staff work directly with students on students' own disciplinary writing assignments.

⁸ An Autumn 2000 survey of UK university staff generated a list of 64 varieties of writing that are asked of students (Ganobcsik-Williams, 2004: 13-14). As technological advances occur new forms of writing, including, for example, blogs and wikis, continue to be introduced into the HE curriculum.

tied to thinking and formulating ideas; to learn to argue positions and substantiate claims; to reflect on professional practices and to develop the skills of articulating thoughts and addressing a variety of audiences. Our experience of the last four years is that CAW is always being challenged to respond to the demands that students create and that the unanticipated demands of new and existing writing genres require dynamic and flexible responses.

5. The Challenge

5.1 CAW's problems are due to its success. Demand for CAW's services has risen steadily in the four years since its establishment: for example, the number of students seen in individual appointments has increased by 221%. The current delivery mode is predominantly face-to-face with an emphasis on one-to-one sessions. This model is not scaleable, nor is it accessible to all the university's students. The challenge is to deploy learning and teaching technologies successfully in order to make CAW services available to all our students at times and in ways which they choose, without losing the highly-valued personal element of what we currently do. In other words the franchise needs to be extended without compromising the quality of the service. This cannot be achieved simply replicating what CAW does in an "online" mode, nor can we rely on existing face-to-face methods with the incremental addition of technology. A fundamental redesign of the way in which the academic writing curriculum is delivered is required to meet new demands.

5.2 In meeting this challenge the project will address:

- Serving the needs of diverse learners in flexible ways
- Raising retention rates, particularly of first year students
- Supporting non-traditional students
- Enabling students to use their own personal technologies and supporting them in developing learning practices which suit them
- Providing academic writing support both as a transferable skill but and as a means of helping students to improve their learning and performance in their subject areas
- Providing academic staff development in the teaching of writing in the disciplines, including ways of giving online support

6. Fit with Coventry University's Institutional Strategy

6.1 The University's mission statement⁹ states that:

Our authority to teach is founded on and informed by:

- *Expert and specialist knowledge of the subject and its application*
- *Evidence-based, cutting-edge practice*
- *Research into the learning experience of students*
- *Applied research into relevant problems and issues*

These claims are backed up by the following curriculum design principles; that students will:

- *Gain from the national and international learning communities within which we operate*
- *Learn effectively, using leading technologies and advanced facilities where appropriate*

6.2 The COWL project fits squarely within these aspirations and the University's significant existing support for and resourcing of the work of CAW is evidence of specific commitment to the importance of academic writing as a core skill for all our students.

⁹ <http://www.coventry.ac.uk/missionstatement>

7. Links to other projects

7.1 The JISC-funded AWESOME project¹⁰, of which CAW is a partner, deals with a specific aspect of student writing: third year dissertations. The project aims to develop a methodology for using social software to support dissertation projects and writing. The use of social software promotes collective intelligence and active engagement of users in collaborative creation and sharing of content. We will build on experience of working on this project and extend the lessons learned to wider aspects of academic writing.

7.2 Another development area to which the COWL project is linked is that of electronic feedback on student texts. Student feedback on student writing has traditionally been in written form, but, recently, work has been undertaken to explore ways in which new technologies can enhance feedback, particularly as students increasingly are required to submit their work electronically. There is evidence that technology-enhanced and multimodal feedback can be both more effective and more acceptable to students. Screen capture software¹¹ can enable tutors to record their on-screen actions and their spoken comments while creating feedback. The resulting files can be distributed to individual learners, for example through a VLE, and can be played back by students as video with a running commentary as various sections of their writing are highlighted, amended and discussed. Small scale trials at Coventry and at Westminster (Stannard, 2007)¹² suggest that many students welcome this kind of multimodal feedback. Related work is also being undertaken by the JISC-funded *Sounds Good* project¹³.

7.3 In addition CAW is conducting internally funded research on the efficacy of one-to-one writing tutorials using discourse analysis of pre- and post- tutorial drafts and interviews with disciplinary lecturers to assess the effects of CAW interventions on students' written work and performance in their disciplines. This work provides a model for analysing and assessing the effectiveness of the online tutorials and interventions and will form a major input into the COWL project's evaluation approach. Inter alia, this will allow us to compare the outcomes from deploying different delivery modes against the established baseline of individualised face-to-face delivery.

7.4 The COWL project will be developed alongside Coventry University's other JISC-funded learning and teaching projects: *RoCoCo*, in which CAW's role is to repurpose research methods writing resources for postgraduate students¹⁴ and *CURVE*, a repositories enhancement project..

8. Project Questions

8.1 The main questions for the project are assessing the effectiveness of online writing tutoring and developing a pedagogy for online tutoring that meets and/or exceeds pedagogies of face-to-face tutoring. Key questions are:

- What are the limitations of online tutoring compared to face-to-face tutoring?
- Is online tutoring more enabling for some students and staff?
- What are the most effective ways of providing online feedback given that staff resources will probably not expand at the same rate as student demand?
- How do learners achieve in academic writing and how should they be supported?
- What additional online resources can be put in place to develop student writing?

¹⁰ http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_users_and_innovation/awesome.aspx

¹¹ Whilst there is significant use of "screencasting" globally little has been published on its use in giving feedback to students. However interesting small-scale experimentation is taking place. See, for example, <http://maricopatech.blogspot.com/2007/08/grading-papers-electronic-way.html>

¹² Stannard, R. (2007) "Using screen capture software in student feedback." HEA English Subject Centre Commissioned Case Studies. Available at: <http://www.english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/publications/casestudies/technology/camtasia.php>

¹³ http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_users_and_innovation/soundsgood.aspx

¹⁴ See http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_elearning_capital/reproduce/rococo.aspx

- How can we best ensure that writing support is accessible to all students, including those with disabilities?

9. Project Outline

9.1 The project is organised into three main phases. The first three months will comprise a project definition phase during which current practice at Coventry and elsewhere will be reviewed in order to establish a baseline against which project impact can be evaluated. This will allow the project team to refine and clarify the project vision and complete a full project plan for ourselves and JISC. This phase will benefit greatly from engagement with other projects in the programme and close working with the JISC support project.

9.2 The second phase will comprise a pilot implementation of the new curriculum delivery approach (including online writing tutorials and sample stand-alone writing resources and teaching materials) in two areas of the university: paramedic science and economics. These two groups of students represent “extremes” of the contexts in which learners find themselves. The paramedic students are in a highly mobile, work-based situation, studying online with relatively little attendance at the university. Many are mature students. The students are also highly dispersed. However, the professional standards they are required to meet lay emphasis on clear communication in all forms, including writing. The economists are predominantly full-time students studying face-to-face and in the 18-23 age bracket.

9.3 In the third phase we will implement a curriculum delivery system which has been improved in the light of results from the pilot phase. The implementation will be across all appropriate areas of CAW’s work, both directly with students and through cascading the teaching of writing via academics in the disciplines. Although full-scale implementation across the institution will inevitably be phased we would expect to complete it over a two-year time period.

9.4 Evaluation will be a continuing process throughout the life of the project and beyond it.

10. Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder	Priority	Stakeholder’s perspective	Action
Students	5	Demonstrated demand for academic writing support in a wide variety of contexts, including online.	Primary target of the project
CAW staff	5	Existing demand is becoming impossible to meet; extended service will place stress on staffing resources.	Development of scalable delivery model will allow CAW staff to direct effort more effectively
Faculty staff	4	Better equipped students perform better. Desire to help students but need guidance.	Project helps develop faculty staff. More CAW resource available. Online tutorials provided.
eLU	2	Development of e-learning services for students and staff	Integrate online academic writing into CUOnline.
Library, other support units	2	Need for specialised, professional, accessible unit to which they can refer students	CAW already fulfils this but will be better equipped to help all students
University	4	Improved retention; more effective use of resources; improved student satisfaction	Key objectives of the project. Undertake evaluation of retention effects and economic benefits.
JISC Community	5	Usefulness of OWL model for other institutions	Ensure deliverables and outputs are fully usable by others.

1 = low level of priority; 5 = very high level

11. Fit to the Call

11.1 This project is firmly situated in the learning and teaching practice aspect of the call. It also impacts on the technology and standards arena through the integration of online writing

support within CUOnline¹⁵. Furthermore, the development of an OWL also supports the institutional strategic agenda as briefly outlined in section 6 above.

12. Aims and Objectives

12.1 The overall aim of the project is to evaluate current provision in online writing support at Coventry University and elsewhere and to develop a comprehensive, integrated platform of technologically enhanced writing support mechanisms to be trialled at Coventry University and disseminated for further evaluation and use at other UK HEIs.

12.2 The major objectives of the project are to:

- Deploy new technologies imaginatively in the area of academic writing
- Help discipline-based teaching staff to develop the teaching skills to, in turn, help their own students develop skill and confidence in writing
- Move towards more collaborative group teaching approaches, both in face-to-face environments and online
- Develop new pedagogical models for academic writing
- Develop new approaches to exploiting social software tools for collaborative learning in the academic writing domain¹⁶
- Investigate and learn from experience of teaching academic writing skills in other countries
- Explore the affordances of existing e-learning tools, whether currently used to support academic writing or in other curriculum areas that can be customised for online tutoring of academic writing at Coventry University and be re-used elsewhere.

13. Anticipated Outcomes

13.1 We believe the major outcomes will be:

- Improved student retention
- Improved student performance on their substantive programmes
- Much greater take-up of CAW services
- Long term sustainability plan for CAW
- More confident faculty-based staff who can help students with their writing skills directly
- More effective use of CAW, faculty and other university staff
- A much fuller menu of support for students in their academic writing development
- Improved student satisfaction

14. How We Will Benefit From JISC Funding

14.1 JISC funding will markedly accelerate and widen the scope of roll-out of OWL activities and services at Coventry University. It will be the catalyst for change in improving the pedagogy of academic writing support and making OWL learning services available when and where students choose and via their choice of technology. In this way the reach of academic writing support will be extended to vital and needy groups of students who currently we are unable to interact with in an effective and positive way.

14.2 We also wish to both share our experiences with others in the sector and learn from experience elsewhere, including JISC projects in the areas of m-learning. The COWL project will provide a rich set of resources covering the pedagogic, cultural and technological perspectives of academic writing support, and associated briefing and training packages.

¹⁵ CUOnline is the name given to the university's online learning environment. It integrates a VLE with other institutional systems via a portal, a PDP system, the institutional repository (CURVE), a blogging/wiki environment, a social networking environment (based on Elgg), voice and conferencing tools and comprehensive tracking capabilities.

¹⁶ The JISC (2007) publication *Supporting Lifelong Learners* provides good grounding for this argument. See page 17 of <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/elearningpedagogy/ebooktwo2007.pdf>

15. Project Management

15.1 The project will be directed by Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams who will be in regular contact with the JISC programme manager. The Project Director will be aided by a Steering Group comprising the Director of Higher Education Development (Chair), nominees of the four Deans, the Librarian, the Director of Student Welfare and Professor Hilary Nesi of the English Department. Project Management will be carried out by Sharon Simkiss of CSHE. Sharon will be supported by the university's Business Development Support Office who will ensure that all JISC and university requirements are met and provide day-to-day support in delivering the project. The university manages projects according to Prince2 principles and both Sharon and all BDSO staff are trained in Prince2 methods. In addition the project will be managed according to JISC Project Management Guidelines.

15.2 The project will be organised into a number of workpackages as shown in Table 1.

16. Project Team

16.1 *Dr. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams* is the Director of CAW and will be the overall Project Director. Lisa will also lead workpackages 1, 2 and 6. The Project Manager will be Sharon Simkiss who has considerable experience of managing both commercial and research/development projects. The rest of the team will be drawn from CAW itself (Borg, Deane, Summers), elsewhere in CSHE (Broughan, Childs, Tutchings) and from partner faculties (Garrett, Guest). A number of these staff have The project research assistant post will be offered to the part-time academic writing tutors and we fully expect to be able to appoint from amongst that group. Brief details of the project team are included as Annex B.

17. Risk Analysis

Risk	Severity 1 - 5	Probability 1 - 5	Risk Score	Actions
Staff loss	3	2	6	Use current staff. If project staff leave or become unavailable other members of the group can pick up the work.
Loss of Project Director	3	2	6	Other workpackage leaders have experience and could take over. Experience of directing JISC projects is also available elsewhere in the university.
Poor project management	5	1	5	Use experienced team. Divide responsibilities for day-to-day operational project management from university business management systems to provide internal checks.
Poor faculty staff buy-in	4	1	4	Stress the positives for faculty staff (better prepared students, fewer assessment failures etc.) Provide supportive training. Work closely with course teams rather than isolate individuals.
Lack of institutional buy-in.	4	1	4	Keep Academic Executive informed of progress. Publish project successes internally. Emphasise benefits rather than stress difficulties.

Note: 1 is low; 5 is high. Risk Score = severity times probability.

Table 1: Workpackages

* Workpackage leader

Package	Staff	Activities	Months	Days	Deliverables	Milestones
1	Review of current practice	Ganobcsik-Williams* Research Assistant	Describe current curriculum deliver practices at Coventry University and a small number of other benchmark institutions from UK and elsewhere. Identify existing technologies and characteristics of their effective use	1 - 3	10 45	Description of range of current delivery approaches. Submission of detailed project plan to JISC. Practice review report.
2	Develop new curriculum delivery plan	Ganobcsik-Williams*	Identify technologies and e-learning tools which the project intends to deploy. Identify dependencies with and implications for other institutional processes and provision. Gain internal stakeholder support.	2 - 3	20	Comparison of new model with existing approaches highlighting projected benefits. Detailed plan and rationale for the new model including expected outcomes. Stakeholder briefings. Report to Steering Group. Briefings completed.
3	Develop new pedagogic approaches	Deane* Childs Brick	Develop approaches based on workpackages 1 and 2. Develop feedback approach based on "screencasting".	4 - 6	30 15 15	New pedagogic tools. "Requirements" for online implementation.
4	Integrations and adaptation of new technologies and tools	Tutchings* Summers	Develop integrations with CUOnline	4 - 6	20 30	Working, documented integrations. Guidance on implementing technologies for OWLs. Illustrative materials to exemplify the new learning and teaching approaches. Integrations tested and in production.
5	Pilot implementation	Deane* Garrett Guest CAW Tutors	Test new approach with paramedic science and economics students. Workshops for Academic Writing tutors	4 - 10	40 10 10 24	Two case study reports together with a comparative commentary. Workshop materials. Case studies published. Workshops delivered.
6	Embedding new practices across the university	Ganobcsik-Williams* CAW Tutors	Staff development for faculty-based staff. Workshops for Academic Writing tutors	13 - 22	80 40	Exemplar staff development materials. Guidance for other institutions seeking to establish OWLs. Revised workshop materials. Materials published. Guidance notes published. Workshops delivered.
7	Evaluation	Borg* Research Assistant Borg Broughan Borg	Establish evaluation criteria and methodology (in parallel with WP 1). Data collection End of phase 1 evaluation End of project evaluation and sustainability plan	1 - 3 1 - 24 11 - 12 23 - 24	15 48 25 30 20	Evaluation plan Interim report Final report and sustainability plan Report to Steering Group Report to Steering Group Final report to JISC

18. Evaluation

18.1 Evaluation is a key element (recognised as the separate workpackage number 7) in judging a project's "worth": in other words, how well the project's objectives have been achieved (in terms of outputs and outcomes), and how well the project has been able to engage the range of stakeholders encompassed by the framework of the project and its associated processes of data collection, analysis and dissemination of findings. In terms of evaluation, the methodologies and specific techniques used for evaluation will depend on both the stage and the potentially diverse needs of the stakeholders/users; i.e. the focus of evaluation during the development phase of the project will differ from that of the implementation stage.

18.2 Evaluation at the project start phase will include agreeing the specific objectives, activities, deliverables and milestones required to meet the overall aims and objectives stated in this bid. The assessment/evaluation of the project processes phase will encompass planning, communication, resourcing, quality assessment and budgeting; while the project finish and implementation phase will focus on the outputs (e.g. training courses/programmes, toolkits) and outcomes (e.g. changes in work practices, attitudes/values, change in organisational structure/processes, etc.) from the project. However the most important elements will be to assess what has been learnt and how that learning has been transformed into actions which result in tangible and identifiable benefits for stakeholders.

19. Dissemination and Engagement with the Community

19.1 A key element of the project will be to share the experience, evaluations and results within the University as a part of our policy to enhance learning and teaching, and also with the wider community. Dissemination will be an ongoing activity throughout the project and will take place through a variety of mechanisms, including a project website, a blog, and contributions to internal and external conferences. We will publicise the potential benefits to the sector, and will produce documentation that facilitates training and support for other institutions interested in developing OWLs. We will participate fully with JISC organised events including the involvement of senior university managers at Pro-Vice Chancellor and Director level. We will also be active in relevant groups such as the HEA Reflective Practice SIG¹⁷ and the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing (EATAW), whose Summer 2009 Conference is being hosted by Coventry University.

20. Policy, management and legal issues

20.1 IPR will remain with Coventry University. All results and outputs will be freely disseminated and made available for use by the HE and FE communities. All project reports and materials produced will be freely available on the project website and will be accessible via CURVE (the University's institutional repository). It is not anticipated that the project will result in the development of any new software.

21. Budget

21.1 The budget table is shown below. The time inputs shown include a significant input for engagement with JISC activities, particularly the support and synthesis project. The Coventry University contribution will be the project direction and management costs and the time of Summers and the CAW tutors (costed at FeC). In addition the project will call on the time of the Instructional Design team (not shown in the budget table).

¹⁷ CAW hosted the September 2007 meeting of this group which has an interest in academic writing. See <http://www.health.heacademy.ac.uk/sig/critref/27th-september-2007-sig-meeting/0709crsig?searchterm=academic+writing>

Directly Incurred Staff	Apr08–Mar09	Apr09–Mar10	Apr10 – Mar11	TOTAL £
Post, Grade, No. Hours & % FTE	£0	£0	£0	£0
Total Directly Incurred Staff (A)	£0	£0	£0	£0
Non-Staff	Apr08–Mar09	Apr09–Mar10	Apr10 – Mar11	TOTAL £
Travel and expenses	£1000	£1000	£1000	£3000
Dissemination	£0	£1000	£1000	£2000
Total Directly Incurred Non-Staff (B)	£1000	£2000	£2000	£5000
Directly Incurred Total (C) (A+B=C)	£1000	£2000	£2000	£5000
Directly Allocated	Apr08–Mar09	Apr09–Mar10	Apr10 – Mar11	TOTAL £
Directly Allocated Total (D)	£87,671	£73,169	£25,662	£186,502
Indirect Costs (E)	£63,232	£49,495	£23,112	£135,839
Total Project Cost (C+D+E)	£151,903	£124,664	£50,774	£327,341
Amount Requested from JISC	£91,142	£74,798	£30,464	£196,404
Institutional Contributions	£60,761	£49,866	£20,310	£130,937
Percentage Contributions over the life of the project	JISC 60%	Partners 40 %		Total 100%
No. FTEs used to calculate indirect and estates charges, and staff included	No FTEs 2.832	Which Staff Staff shown as directly allocated in table above. Total = 623 days; 220 days per year.		

Note: All figures shown are rounded.

Annex A**FOI Withheld Information Form**

We would like JISC to consider withholding the following sections or paragraphs from disclosure, should the contents of this proposal be requested under the Freedom of Information Act, or if we are successful in our bid for funding and our project proposal is made available on JISC's website.

We acknowledge that the FOI Withheld Information Form is of indicative value only and that JISC may nevertheless be obliged to disclose this information in accordance with the requirements of the Act. We acknowledge that the final decision on disclosure rests with JISC.

Section	Relevant exemption from disclosure under FOI	Justification
21	s.43 Commercial Interests	Commercial in confidence, budget information refers directly to individual salaries

Appendix B: Project Staff

Dr. Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams directs the Centre for Academic Writing (CAW) at Coventry University. Formerly the Co-ordinator of Academic Writing for the University of Warwick Writing Programme, Lisa has taught Academic Writing courses for undergraduate and postgraduate students in a variety of disciplines. Lisa has also had considerable experience as a writing centre tutor in US universities and has worked with the Royal Literary Fund to set up one-to-one tutorials in Academic Writing in UK universities. Lisa serves on the boards of three major Academic Writing organizations, EATAW, EWCA, and IWCA. Her publications include a landmark report (RLF 2004) and edited book (Palgrave Macmillan 2006) on the teaching of Academic Writing in the UK context, as well as articles in *Rhetorica*, *The Writing Center Journal*, and *Computers in Composition*.

Mark Childs joined Coventry University as a Teaching Development Fellow in e-learning in July 2008. Between 2001 and 2008 he worked at the University of Warwick on externally-funded e-learning projects, following five years working on national and international collaborative e-learning projects at the University of Wolverhampton. Most recently these projects include setting up a telematic teaching facility within the Learning Grid at the University of Warwick. Between July 2004 and July 2008 Mark was the chair of [DIVERSE](#), the leading international group of practitioners in the use of visual technologies in education and he is also on the editorial board of [Innovate](#), an online journal of e-learning published by Nova South-Eastern University.

Sharon Simkiss is the Manager of CSHE. Prior to joining CSHE she worked in the commercial arm of Coventry University as an administrator and project manager. She has successfully managed a diverse range of projects and is trained in Prince2 methods.

Dr. Mary Deane is a Senior Lecturer at Coventry's Centre for Academic Writing (CAW). Her research specialisms in the field of Academic writing include online peer review, written feedback, and cultures of writing in institutional and disciplinary contexts. Prior to specialising in rhetoric for contemporary HE students, she taught Medieval and Renaissance Literature, Middle English Translation, and Seventeenth Century Literature at the University of Warwick. In 2008, Mary was awarded a Teaching Excellence Award for her writing consultancy with staff and students. She runs successful Writing Retreats for academics whereby she fosters effective planning and execution of publication plans. She also promotes student writers' independence and seeks to enhance their performance by raising levels of motivation. Her current initiatives include work to improve retention rates at Level 1 in Law and Economics and to respond to Widening Participation through explicit Academic Writing instruction. These relate to her recent publications, which reveal a strong commitment to 'Writing in the Disciplines' (WiD), a pedagogical approach that recognises the role of writing in cognitive development and the distinctive qualities of writing in subject studies at HE. She is currently writing a volume called *Writing in the UK Disciplines* to raise awareness of this research field (forthcoming 2010) and has published in *Teaching in Higher Education* (2007), *Maths, Stats, and OR Connections* (2008), *Zeitschrift-Schreiben* (2008), and *Writing Research Across Borders: Proceedings of the 2008 Santa Barbara Writing Conference*.

Ray Summers is the Learning Technologist at CAW. He conceptualises and designs digital and multi-media resources to facilitate the Centre's staff development remit and to enhance learning and teaching environments at Coventry University. Ray leads CAW's web-based projects which promote writing pedagogy, including a popular site with a range of downloads enabling students to be independent in their research and referencing for academic papers. Ray also provides training to colleagues seeking to extend their knowledge of learning technologies. He has been particularly successful in the design and development of audio visual materials teaching the conventions of Academic Writing in disciplinary contexts, including sample student papers which help students to engage with marking criteria.

Billy Brick is Languages Centre Manager at Coventry University. After an initial lecturing career in building management he turned his attention to EFL teaching and subsequently to the wider area of academic writing. He has long experience of working with students whose first language is other than English. HE has experimented with and researched a number of applications of technology to supporting and assessing students in their writing activities including work with voice tools embedded in VLEs, podcasting and, latterly, screencasting for giving feedback.

John Tutchings. After graduating from Coventry University with a Honours Degree in Computer Science John started working in the university's Computing Services Department. Within CSV he has worked in most sections, from systems administration to software development. Eventually he settled in the Applications Section where he was responsible for the configuration of various web sites including caring for the University's installation of WebCT. John is now the Technical Specialist in e-learning systems within the e-Learning Unit and he will be responsible for integrating Echo360 with CUOnline and other university systems. He will also lead the development of the prototype IPTV system.

Mark Garrett is Programme Manager for paramedics course at Coventry University. Mark has been working closely with Mary Deane on a strand of our 'Writing in the Disciplines' initiative.

Jon Guest is First Year Tutor for undergraduate economics courses. Jon has won a number of awards for his pioneering work in teaching first year economics including implementation of "experimental economics" teaching and development of communication skills. In this he has been working closely with Erik Borg in another 'Writing in the Disciplines' strand.

Erik Borg teaches undergraduate modules on academic writing and leads the Centre for Academic Writing research project into the development of student writing. He also works with staff in the disciplines on cascading the teaching of writing and on their own scholarly writing. He has published articles in *Art, Design, and Communication in Higher Education*, *ELT Journal*, the *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, and *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, and given presentations at conferences on topics related to intertextuality and plagiarism, the assessment of writing, and writing in art and design. He is a successful co-applicant in a series of ESRC-sponsored seminars (2008-09) discussing alternative forms of the doctoral thesis in the light of multimodality and e-learning research.

Christine Broughan is a pedagogical researcher at Coventry University. She has a two year secondment to the iPED [inquiring pedagogies] network and has a key role in exploring the issues of student retention. She is interested in research that explores the student experience at university and a key aspect of her role is to support academic staff in evaluating curriculum design and pedagogical practices. She has extensive project management experience and has developed a number of evaluative tools and reports for institutional research.

Coventry University
Priory Street
Coventry CV1 5FB
Telephone 024 7688 7688

Professor Madeleine Atkins
Vice-Chancellor



Ms Lisa Gray
JISC
Northavon House
Coldharbour Lane
Bristol
BS16 1QD

JISC2107CMEL01

Date 21/07/08

Dear Ms Gray,

JISC Circular 08/08: Transforming Curriculum Delivery Through Technology

I am pleased to support Coventry University's bid under the current round of the JISC e-Learning Programme call for projects in the areas of curriculum delivery, assessment and course advertising.

Coventry University has made significant investment in order to establish the Centre for Academic Writing. We are very proud of the positive feedback we have received from students who have made use of the Centre however we are also concerned that the Centre's work is not being made as widely available as it needs to be. This project will allow us to develop new ways of delivering the writing curriculum to ensure that all students can benefit from the work of the Centre, no matter who they are or the contexts in which they are studying.

I am also sure that the project will provide valuable insight and guidance for other universities and colleges and we are happy to take a lead in helping develop new technology-enhanced ways of developing the academic writing curriculum in the national and international arenas.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely,

Professor Madeleine Atkins
Vice-Chancellor



THE QUEEN'S
ANNIVERSARY PRIZES
FOR HIGHER AND FURTHER EDUCATION

2007

Vice-Chancellor's Office
Direct Line 024 7688 8212
Fax 024 7688 8638

www.coventry.ac.uk