

CODING CONSCIOUSNESS LLC

Curriculum compliance, made computable.

An academic intelligence layer for career and technical colleges. Our platform reads courses directly from the learning management system, evaluates them against a computable model of curricular alignment, and is in live production use at an ACCSC-accredited partner college.

Phoenix, Arizona

United States

Bootstrapped

No equity raised

Google Cloud

Cloud Run, Cloud Storage



Gemini Startup Forum 2026

Every course must prove alignment. No one can read them all.

1

The mandate

Accreditation and programmatic approval rest on demonstrating that learning objectives, activities, and assessments align. For career and technical colleges this is high-stakes and recurring.

2

The method

A dean or program chair reads courses by hand. The judgment applied varies from reviewer to reviewer, and nothing records why a decision was made.

3

The ceiling

No institution can examine every objective in every module across every program on a recurring cycle. Review capacity gets spent on volume instead of judgment.

135

minutes per week

Median time academic reviewers reported spending sorting non-actionable noise before they could begin reviewing curriculum at all.

Source: our own concept-testing interviews, six independent academic reviewers, 2026.

This is in production, not in a design document.

22

courses audited

344

modules parsed

935

findings generated

1

production tenant

The platform connects to the college's learning management system, extracts course structure and learning objectives, and evaluates them against a computable model of constructive alignment and cognitive rigor. Academic staff run full-program audits without developer assistance.

Usability and feasibility documented in a March 2026 empirical evidence report covering full-program coverage of a graduate technology curriculum, with reviewer-confirmed findings.

One rule produces 78 percent of all findings.

731 findings from a single ambiguous-verb rule

204 all other rules

935 total findings across 344 modules and 22 courses, production audit

Five in six

of the reviewer effort in our adjudication pilot went to findings that should never have reached a curriculum reviewer at all.

Correct, not wrong

Most of those detections were accurate. They simply belonged to an upstream parser or content layer, not to the dean.

Unreadable at scale

A twelve-course program produces hundreds of flat findings. That is not a report. It is a reason to stop using the tool.

Reviewers validated the concept and named the risk.

Comprehension



Usefulness in real work



Intent to use



Trust in the routing



Six independent reviewers, none on the project team: two deans, two program chairs, one accreditation and compliance staff member, one curriculum coordinator. Preliminary concept testing on mock-ups, not an efficacy claim.

The trust gap is the product spec.

- Five of six named the same fear unprompted: a genuine curricular issue routed away from them and hidden.
- Every one proposed the same remedy: a reviewer override plus an audit view over the upstream queue.
- So misrouting rate is now a primary evaluation metric, and override and auditability are in scope for the build rather than deferred.

A learned routing layer between the audit and the reviewer.

01

Audit engine

Deterministic alignment rules over course content extracted from the LMS, with generative retrieval interpreting objective and assessment language.

Exists today

»

02

Routing layer

A trained model that learns from expert adjudication where each finding should be resolved, and returns a calibrated score alongside the route.

In development

»

03

Reviewer queue

Only the findings that belong to an academic reviewer, ordered by relevance, each with a stated reason, an override, and an audit trail.

In development

The routing layer is the component that converts a working single-site tool into something we can sell to a second institution. Without it, the findings are accurate and unusable.

One reachable beachhead, then land and expand.

Beachhead

ACCSC-accredited career and technical colleges. A defined, reachable segment that shares one accreditation standard, one review burden, and one buyer profile with our existing partner college.

Expansion

Community colleges and other small institutions under the same pressure with no engineering staff. Delivery is multi-tenant SaaS: the college connects its LMS by API and selects an accreditation profile in days.

\$18k to \$36k

per year, single-campus career college

Annual institutional license, tiered by institution size and number of programs. Because delivery is software rather than services, gross margin follows the standard SaaS profile and the cost to serve an additional institution is low.

Planned pricing model, to be confirmed against early-access pricing. Not yet commercially available.

Where we actually are, stated plainly.

\$0

annual recurring revenue

\$0

equity capital raised

3

people on the team

1

college in production

- The entity was incorporated in Arizona in 2006 and previously used for consulting. The education platform is a 2025 to 2026 build, with its first institutional deployment going live in 2026.
- Non-dilutive federal research funding is pending: a U.S. Department of Education SBIR application submitted in June 2026, with an award decision expected in 2027. Nothing is awarded yet.
- No venture capital, no angel round, no convertible instruments. Development to date has been founder-funded.

Four problems we would rather not solve alone.

01 Calibration when a miss is expensive

A false negative does not waste a click, it costs a dean's confidence in the entire queue. How do we set, defend, and monitor thresholds on a small and expensively labeled dataset?

02 The labeling economics

Labels require qualified academic adjudicators, which makes data the binding constraint rather than compute. Where can Gemini reduce that burden without quietly becoming the label we are trying to validate against?

03 The multi-tenant cost curve

We want an honest read on going from one tenant to many on Cloud Run and Cloud Storage before we commit to the architecture, not after.

04 A segment Google rarely hears from

Small institutions under regulatory review with no engineering staff, where the buyer, the administrator, and the end user are the same overworked person. We can bring that feedback into the room.

We are not raising at this event. We are trying to de-risk the transition from one working deployment to many.

Engineering and academic judgment, in the same room.

Rodney James

Founder and Chief Executive

Doctoral candidate in educational psychology with applied AI implementation experience. Architect and operator of the audit platform, and holder of an academic leadership role at the partner college, which is how we have intrinsic access to the workflow and the audit data.

Kellyn Wines

Chief Operating Officer

Graduate degree in educational leadership and twenty years inside academic institutions. Owns end-user research and serves as the second independent adjudicator on the labeling work.

Simon Davis

Engineering and Delivery Lead

Owns the data pipeline, the platform integration, and the evaluation harness as software.

Most entrants to this market have the engineering or the academic domain.

The product only works if the same team has both.

