



THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform

Grant Proposal: Gilead Platform

MEDUC 631-2 | Mount St. Mary's University

Mount St. Mary's University

Emmitsburg, Maryland 21727

Kayla Canfield

Instructional Design & Technology

May 8, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Purpose Statement	4
Literature Review and Professional Standards	5
Program Goals	7
Goals in Relation to Research and Professional Standards	7
Program Summary Table (Table 1)	8
Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency	9
Goal Statement and Alignment	10
Objective 1.1: Design and Develop Writing Modules	10
Objective 1.2: Implement Modules in Pilot Courses	11
Goal 1 Objectives and Tasks (Table 2)	12
Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity	13
Goal Statement and Alignment	14
Objective 2.1: Implement Process-Documentation Tools	15
Objective 2.2: Develop Academic Integrity Protocol	15
Goal 2 Objectives and Tasks (Table 3)	15
Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access	16
Goal Statement and Alignment	17
Objective 3.1: Recruit Representative Pilot Cohort	17
Objective 3.2: Evaluate Access and Engagement Outcomes	18
Goal 3 Objectives and Tasks (Table 4)	18
Evaluation Plan	19
Surveys	20
Instructor Interviews	20
Student Focus Groups	21
Reporting and Budget	21
Evaluation Plan Schedule (Table 5)	21
Self-Care Plan	23
Self-Care Plan Schedule (Table 6)	26
Budget	26
Budget Narrative	27
Summary Budget Table (Table 7)	29
Appendix A: Evaluation Instruments	30

Appendix B: Budget Cost Justification	34
Appendix C: AI Disclosure Statement and Reflection	40
References	45

INTRODUCTION

Purpose Statement

The purpose of the proposed Academic Literacy Collaborative is to request funding to design and implement Gilead, a digital learning platform that provides scaffolded writing instruction within first-year and lower-division undergraduate courses to improve student writing development and academic readiness. The pilot program will serve approximately 120 students across six lower-division course sections at Mount St. Mary's University, deploy in three campus learning management systems (Canvas, Moodle, and Blackboard), and run across two consecutive semesters from October 2026 through June 2027.

Students across United States colleges write analytically from the start of their first semester, yet many enter without the reading, writing, and grammar skills needed to meet those expectations. This gap is well documented and affects first-generation students most, who arrive less prepared for academic conventions (Stephens et al., 2014).

Introductory writing courses function as gateway courses, and early performance in these courses determines long-term outcomes. According to research from the Aspen Institute (2022), students who pass gateway courses in their first 30 credits are more likely to complete credentials, while those who struggle lose momentum and graduate at lower rates. Gaps in writing preparation place students at risk from the start of their academic experience.

Current approaches do not address this need. Faculty cannot deliver foundational reading and writing instruction within content courses, and existing supports such as writing centers remain optional and unevenly accessed. This structure shifts responsibility onto students to seek help outside their classes, which disadvantages those who do not know what resources exist or cannot reach them consistently. Instructors also face increasing difficulty verifying that submitted work reflects students' own effort and understanding in an environment infiltrated by AI writing tools. These barriers impede composition skill development and the practice of academic honesty.

Research supports a more structured and integrated approach. Studies show that students improve when they receive explicit guidance across all stages of the writing process, including planning, drafting, and revision (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2016). Research on first-generation students also shows that academic outcomes improve when programs recognize and build on the experiences students bring with them (Stephens et al., 2014). Writing support must run sustained, structured, and embedded within the courses students already take.

The Academic Literacy Collaborative responds to this need through the development and pilot implementation of Gilead, a digital learning platform created through this grant. Gilead will provide course-embedded writing support that guides students through each stage of the writing process within their existing coursework. In its initial phase, the program will serve 120 students across six lower-division course sections over two consecutive semesters at Mount St. Mary's University. Implementation will occur within First Year Seminar, Western Civilization, Atlantic Encounters, America in the World, and other lower-level literature courses such as Introduction to Literature.

The platform structures writing as a staged process, guiding students through prewriting, thesis development, drafting, revision, and citation. At each stage, students receive targeted instructional feedback instead of evaluation at final submission alone. Gilead integrates with Canvas, Moodle, and Blackboard, which guarantees that writing instruction occurs in direct connection with course assignments. This design reflects established research that students improve when they receive explicit strategy instruction and guided practice across the full writing process (MacArthur et al., 2016), as well as scaffolded support with gradual release of responsibility (Rosenshine, 2012).

Gilead also incorporates process-based accountability tools, including keystroke tracking, AI-content detection, and plagiarism screening, providing instructors with verifiable evidence of student authorship (Acien et al., 2021). Because the platform operates within existing learning management systems, it extends structured writing support to students who do not access traditional resources. Its design reflects principles of culturally sustaining pedagogy by building on the knowledge and language students bring to their coursework (Paris, 2012).

Without a coordinated approach of this kind, gaps in writing preparation will continue to affect student performance, limit access to advanced coursework, and contribute to ongoing challenges in academic integrity. The Academic Literacy Collaborative addresses these conditions by introducing structured, course-embedded writing support that improves student learning, strengthens writing development, and supports authentic academic work.

Literature Review and Professional Standards

The need for structured writing support at the postsecondary level is well documented. Research shows that first-generation students bear the greatest impact from gaps in academic preparation. These students often enter college without familiarity with institutional expectations and academic conventions (Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014). Stephens and colleagues found that students perform better when programs recognize the experiences they bring to college and build on them. Their research demonstrates that difference-education approaches improve academic outcomes while sustaining student engagement. These findings apply directly to writing programs at institutions like Mount St. Mary's University, where first-generation students represent a growing share of the entering class.

Writing instruction research has identified a set of practices that produce consistent student gains. Students write more effectively when they receive explicit instruction in planning, drafting, and revising, supported by modeling and guided practice (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2016). This approach matters most for students who have not developed strong writing routines through prior instruction. Rosenshine (2012) extends this finding by identifying scaffolded support, guided practice, and gradual release of responsibility as essential to learning demanding cognitive skills. Academic writing requires students to manage reading, reasoning, and communication at once, and structured instruction suits that kind of work. The Gilead platform will apply these principles by organizing writing tasks into staged steps, guiding students from initial ideas through drafting and revision before submission.

Writing-to-learn research shows that writing is a central part of how students develop understanding. McLeod and Miraglia (2001) argue that writing helps students engage directly with course material at a level that reading alone does not produce. This idea informs the design of the Academic Literacy Collaborative, which will integrate writing instruction into lower-division humanities courses. Students in First Year Seminar, Western Civilization, and America in the World will write about difficult historical and literary questions, and Gilead will scaffold that work through structured writing activities that build both knowledge and skill. The Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing identifies metacognition, persistence, and responsibility as essential habits for college writers (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011), and the staged structure of the Gilead platform will cultivate all three by guiding students through planning, drafting, and revision.

Effective program design also accounts for the cultural and linguistic knowledge students bring with them. Paris (2012) describes culturally sustaining pedagogy as instruction that builds on those resources as part of the learning process. In writing instruction, this approach recognizes students' existing communication skills and helps them apply those skills in academic contexts. The Academic Literacy Collaborative will support this process by offering structured entry points into writing, beginning with idea development and moving toward academic analysis. The program aligns with ISTE Standard 6, which calls for students to develop as clear and purposeful communicators through digital tools (ISTE, 2016). Students who work through Gilead will practice writing as a way of shaping and communicating their own ideas.

Academic integrity and authentic student learning present an additional problem this program will address. Instructors face growing difficulty determining whether submitted work reflects students' own thinking. The Gilead platform will shift attention from the final product to the writing process by documenting how students develop their work over time. This approach will give instructors clearer evidence of student effort and understanding (Acien, Morales, Vera-Rodriguez, & Fierrez, 2021). To support student engagement, Gilead will use progress indicators and completion-based incentives designed to sustain participation across each stage of writing (Hamari, Koivisto, & Sarsa, 2014). This structure will reinforce writing as an ongoing process of development.

Program Goals

The Academic Literacy Collaborative pursues three goals. Goal 1: Strengthen writing proficiency among first-year and lower-division students through structured, process-based instruction delivered within their existing coursework. Goal 2: Support academic integrity by giving instructors verifiable documentation of how students develop their writing over time. Goal 3: Expand equitable access to sustained writing instruction for first-generation and underserved students within the LMS environments they already use. These goals draw from research on writing instruction, equity in higher education, and the use of digital tools to support student learning.

Goals in Relation to Research and Professional Standards

Goal 1: Strengthen writing proficiency among first-year and lower-division students through structured, process-based instruction delivered within their existing coursework. This goal draws directly from research on effective writing pedagogy. Students write more effectively when they receive explicit guidance in planning, drafting, and revising their work (MacArthur, Graham, & Fitzgerald, 2016). Rosenshine (2012) demonstrates that demanding skills develop through guided practice with gradual release of responsibility, and academic writing fits that pattern. Writing-to-learn research positions writing as a way for students to develop understanding within their courses (McLeod & Miraglia, 2001). This goal also aligns with the Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing, which identifies metacognition and persistence as essential habits for college writers (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011). The Gilead platform will support these practices by guiding students through each stage of writing and requiring revision and reflection throughout.

Goal 2: Support academic integrity by giving instructors verifiable documentation of how students develop their writing over time. This goal responds to a challenge that traditional writing instruction and existing LMS tools have not resolved. Research shows that process-based approaches give clearer evidence of how students develop their writing over time (Acien, Morales, Vera-Rodriguez, & Fierrez, 2021). Students also engage more consistently when tasks are structured and progress is visible (Hamari, Koivisto, & Sarsa, 2014). Gilead will support this goal by emphasizing the writing process and tracking student progress across stages. This approach aligns with ISTE Standard 6, which calls for clear and responsible communication in digital environments (ISTE, 2016). Students working through Gilead will produce work that reflects both their thinking and their effort.

Goal 3: Expand equitable access to sustained writing instruction for first-generation and underserved students within the LMS environments they already use. This goal grounds itself in research on equity in higher education. Students benefit from programs that recognize and build on the experiences they bring to college (Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014). Paris (2012) argues that instruction should sustain and develop students' existing knowledge as part of the learning process. Gilead will support this goal by providing structured writing instruction within the courses students already take. Students will not need to seek outside resources that may

not reach them. The program also aligns with ISTE Standard 6 by giving all students access to the tools they need to communicate effectively in academic settings (ISTE, 2016).

Table 1

Academic Literacy Collaborative – Gilead Platform Pilot Program

Pilot Year: September 2026 – August 2027 | Mount St. Mary's University, Emmitsburg, MD

Professional Standards	Phase 1: Jul–Sep 2026 Platform Development	Phase 2: Oct–Dec 2026 Pilot Launch	Phase 3: Jan–Mar 2027 Full Implementation	Phase 4: Apr–Jun 2027 Evaluation & Scale
ISTE Std. 6: Creative Communicator Clear, purposeful communication through digital tools	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency; Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency; Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access	Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access
CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework for Success Metacognition, persistence, responsibility	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency; Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency; Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity	Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity
WAC / Writing-to-Learn Framework McLeod & Miraglia (2001): writing as thinking within disciplinary coursework	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency; Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity	Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency; Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity	Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity; Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access	Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity; Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access
Estimated Phase Cost	\$22,000	\$17,500	\$11,500	\$7,400
TOTAL PROGRAM COST	\$58,400 direct cost \$5,840 evaluation (10%) \$11,680 indirect (20%) \$75,920 TOTAL			

Goal Key: Goal 1 = Strengthen Writing Proficiency | Goal 2 = Support Academic Integrity | Goal 3 = Expand Equitable Access

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



GOAL 1

Strengthen Writing Proficiency

ISTE Standard 6 | CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework | WAC Writing-to-Learn Framework

GOAL 1: STRENGTHEN WRITING PROFICIENCY

Goal Statement and Alignment

Goal 1: Strengthen writing proficiency among first-year and lower-division students through structured, process-based instruction delivered within their existing coursework. This goal aligns with ISTE Standard 6, which defines the creative communicator competency as the capacity to communicate clearly and purposefully through digital tools (ISTE, 2016); with the CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing, which identifies metacognition, persistence, and responsibility as the habits of mind that college writing development requires (2011); and with the Writing-to-Learn framework developed by McLeod and Miraglia (2001), which positions writing as the primary mechanism through which students develop disciplinary understanding.

The evidence base for this goal is substantial. MacArthur, Graham, and Fitzgerald (2016) synthesize decades of writing instruction research and establish that explicit strategy instruction in planning, drafting, and revising produces measurable gains in writing quality across student populations and institutional contexts. Rosenshine's (2012) principles of instruction identify guided practice with gradual release of responsibility as the mechanism through which students acquire demanding cognitive skills. Academic writing demands that students coordinate reading, reasoning, argumentation, and grammar at once; students who enter college without explicit training in these stages do not develop them through exposure to writing assignments alone. The CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework identifies metacognition and persistence as the core habits underlying college writing readiness (2011). The Gilead platform will develop both by requiring students to move through each stage of composition before advancing to the next.

The Gilead platform will carry out Goal 1 through eight sequential writing modules embedded in Canvas, Moodle, and Blackboard. Each module addresses one stage of the writing process: generating ideas, narrowing a topic, building a working thesis, locating and citing sources, constructing an outline, drafting body paragraphs, revising for argument and clarity, and editing for grammar and mechanics. Students complete each module within the context of a real course assignment, which keeps instruction tied to the disciplinary content they are studying. At each stage, the platform delivers targeted feedback before the student advances, not only at final submission. Two objectives drive this goal's implementation: designing and developing the platform modules before the pilot begins, and deploying them across six course sections during the pilot year.

Objective 1.1

Design and develop eight scaffolded writing modules for deployment within Canvas, Moodle, and Blackboard.

The Gilead modules require careful instructional design work before any student interacts with the platform. Each module must specify learning objectives, step-by-step student activities, embedded feedback prompts, and LMS gradebook integration requirements. This work will occur during Phase 1 (July through September 2026) and must be complete before faculty training begins in late August. Two tasks carry out Objective 1.1.

Task 1: Develop detailed instructional storyboards for all eight Gilead writing modules; specify learning objectives, step-by-step student activities, embedded feedback prompts, and LMS integration requirements for each stage of the writing process. Assigned to the Instructional Designer; six weeks (July 1 – August 14, 2026).

Task 2: Build and conduct user-acceptance testing of all eight modules within the Canvas pilot environment; revise content based on structured feedback from a five-member faculty review panel before the fall semester launch. Assigned to the Platform Developer in collaboration with the Instructional Designer; four weeks (August 17 – September 12, 2026).

Objective 1.2

Implement Gilead writing modules across six lower-division course sections during the two-semester pilot year.

Implementation requires faculty preparation before students encounter the platform and consistent data collection throughout the pilot. Instructors new to embedded writing technology need structured support before using Gilead in their courses. Reliable outcome data also requires a standardized assessment instrument applied at the start and end of each semester. Two tasks carry out Objective 1.2.

Task 1: Facilitate two three-hour faculty professional development sessions for six pilot instructors; cover Gilead platform navigation, module assignment in Canvas, student progress monitoring, and process-record review. Assigned to the Program Coordinator; two sessions of three hours each, held during the final two weeks of August 2026.

Task 2: Administer pre- and post-semester writing assessments to all 120 pilot students using a shared analytic rubric developed by participating faculty; score submissions to measure writing proficiency gains attributable to scaffolded instruction. Assigned to the Program Evaluator; runs across both pilot semesters (October 2026 – June 2027).

Table 2

Goal 1 Objectives and Tasks: Strengthen Writing Proficiency

Goal	Objective 1.1: Design and Develop Writing Modules	Objective 1.2: Implement Modules in Pilot Courses
Goal 1: Strengthen writing proficiency among first-year and lower-division students through structured, process-based instruction within existing coursework. (ISTE Std. 6; CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework; WAC Framework)	Task 1: Develop instructional storyboards for all 8 Gilead modules; specify objectives, activities, and feedback prompts for each writing stage. Assigned to: Instructional Designer Duration: 6 weeks (Jul 1 – Aug 14, 2026) Task 2: Build and test all 8 modules in Canvas with structured feedback from a 5-member faculty review panel before fall launch. Assigned to: Platform Developer + Instructional Designer Duration: 4 weeks (Aug 17 – Sep 12, 2026)	Task 1: Facilitate two 3-hour faculty professional development sessions for 6 pilot instructors on Gilead navigation, module use, and student progress monitoring. Assigned to: Program Coordinator Duration: 2 sessions, 3 hrs each (late Aug 2026) Task 2: Administer pre- and post-semester writing assessments to all 120 pilot students using a shared analytic rubric to measure proficiency gains. Assigned to: Program Evaluator Duration: Both pilot semesters (Oct 2026 – Jun 2027)

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



GOAL 2

Support Academic Integrity

ISTE Standard 6 | CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework

GOAL 2: SUPPORT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Goal Statement and Alignment

Goal 2: Support academic integrity by giving instructors verifiable documentation of how students develop their writing over time. This goal aligns with ISTE Standard 6, which calls for students to communicate clearly and responsibly through digital tools (ISTE, 2016), and with the CWPANCTE/NWP Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing, which identifies responsibility as a foundational habit of college writers (2011). AI writing tools now generate fluent academic prose, and most institutions lack reliable means to verify that submitted work reflects a student's own thinking. Existing detection tools evaluate finished products and produce contested, inconsistent results. Gilead takes a different approach: it documents the writing process itself.

Acien and colleagues (2021) demonstrate that individual typing behavior is distinctive enough to identify authors and flag anomalies consistent with AI generation or large-scale text insertion. When a student works through Gilead, the platform generates a timestamped record of keystrokes, draft progressions, revision patterns, and time-on-task data that instructors can review alongside the final submission. This record shifts the evidentiary basis for evaluating student work from a single product to a documented process. Students who complete all eight modules accumulate a verifiable writing history that demonstrates intellectual ownership of their work.

Hamari, Koivisto, and Sarsa (2014) find that gamified learning environments sustain student engagement with sequential tasks by making progress visible and rewarding. Gilead applies this through module completion indicators and stage-by-stage feedback that motivate students to work through each writing stage with care. Students who engage with the process consistently produce work that reflects their own effort and understanding. Goal 2 will be carried out through two objectives: implementing the platform's process-documentation tools across all pilot sections, and establishing an institutional protocol for using Gilead process records in integrity review.

Objective 2.1

Implement keystroke tracking, AI-content detection, and plagiarism scanning across all six pilot course sections.

The process-documentation tools in Gilead require technical configuration before the pilot launches and faculty training before instructors can use the resulting data. Platform configuration must be complete by September 2026, before the first assignments are submitted in October. Two tasks carry out Objective 2.1.

Task 1: Configure Gilead's process-documentation system to capture timestamped keystroke logs, draft progression records, and time-on-task data for every student submission across all six pilot sections. Assigned to the Platform Developer; three weeks (September 1 – 19, 2026).

Task 2: Train six pilot instructors in reading and interpreting Gilead process records, including keystroke logs, draft progressions, and AI-anomaly flags, through a two-hour workshop before the fall semester begins. Assigned to the Program Coordinator; one session (late August 2026).

Objective 2.2

Develop and disseminate an academic integrity protocol for Gilead-generated process data.

Process records remain useful only when instructors apply them consistently. Without an institutional protocol, instructors will use process data unevenly, which creates equity concerns and legal exposure for the university. A written protocol, developed with institutional partners and shared university-wide, establishes fair and consistent use of Gilead data. Two tasks carry out Objective 2.2.

Task 1: Draft an academic integrity protocol; specify when and how instructors should use Gilead process records in integrity reviews; consult with the Dean of Students office and the University's academic integrity officer. Assigned to the Principal Investigator; four weeks (September – October 2026).

Task 2: Present the completed protocol at a Faculty Senate meeting and distribute the document to all department chairs in the six pilot disciplines before the spring 2027 semester. Assigned to the Program Coordinator; one presentation and one distribution cycle (November 2026).

Table 3

Goal 2 Objectives and Tasks: Support Academic Integrity

Goal	Objective 2.1: Implement Process-Documentation Tools	Objective 2.2: Develop Academic Integrity Protocol
Goal 2: Support academic integrity by giving instructors verifiable documentation of how students develop their writing over time. (ISTE Std. 6; CWPA/NCTE/NWP Framework)	Task 1: Configure keystroke logs, draft progression tracking, and time-on-task recording across 6 pilot sections. Assigned to: Platform Developer 3 weeks (Sep 1 – 19, 2026) Task 2: Train 6 instructors to read and interpret Gilead process records and AI-anomaly flags through a 2-hour workshop. Assigned to: Program Coordinator 1 session, 2 hrs (late Aug 2026)	Task 1: Draft integrity protocol for use of Gilead process records in integrity reviews; consult with the Dean of Students and integrity officer. Assigned to: Principal Investigator 4 weeks (Sep – Oct 2026) Task 2: Present protocol at Faculty Senate and distribute to all pilot department chairs before spring 2027. Assigned to: Program Coordinator 1 presentation (Nov 2026)

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



GOAL 3

Expand Equitable Access

ISTE Standard 6 | Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (Paris, 2012)

GOAL 3: EXPAND EQUITABLE ACCESS

Goal Statement and Alignment

Goal 3: Expand equitable access to sustained writing instruction for first-generation and underserved students within the LMS environments they already use. This goal aligns with ISTE Standard 6, which calls for equitable access to digital tools that support meaningful communication (ISTE, 2016), and with Paris's (2012) culturally sustaining pedagogy framework, which calls for instruction that treats the knowledge students bring as an asset and builds outward from it toward academic conventions. The problem this goal addresses is not a shortage of writing resources but an uneven distribution of them.

Writing centers, tutoring appointments, and supplemental instruction exist at most institutions, including Mount St. Mary's University, yet first-generation students use these resources at lower rates than continuing-generation peers (Stephens, Hamedani, & Destin, 2014). The barrier is unfamiliarity: students whose households had no prior experience with college often do not know which resources exist or how to request them. Gilead removes this barrier by delivering writing instruction through Canvas, the same platform students use to submit assignments and communicate with instructors. Students reach writing support through their existing course workflow.

Paris (2012) defines culturally sustaining pedagogy as instruction that builds on students' existing linguistic and cultural knowledge. Gilead's first module opens with open-ended idea generation before introducing thesis structure, so students begin from their own knowledge before encountering the formal requirements of academic argument. Stephens and colleagues (2014) demonstrate that programs structured around difference-education frameworks produce measurable gains for first-generation students without reducing outcomes for continuing-generation peers. Goal 3 will be carried out through two objectives: recruiting a pilot cohort that reflects the University's first-generation student population, and evaluating equitable access and engagement outcomes at the end of each pilot semester.

Objective 3.1

Recruit and enroll a pilot cohort with a minimum of 40 percent first-generation students across all six pilot course sections.

Goal 3 requires intentional recruitment. Without demographic verification, a pilot program can enroll a non-representative sample that understates impact on the target population. Two tasks carry out Objective 3.1.

Task 1: Coordinate with the Office of Institutional Research and the First-Generation Student Success Program to confirm that all six pilot sections meet the 40 percent first-generation

threshold; review enrollment data before the fall semester and flag sections below the threshold for outreach. Assigned to the Program Coordinator; two weeks (August 2026).

Task 2: Administer a baseline survey to all 120 pilot students in the first week of class; document prior writing instruction, comfort with academic writing, and familiarity with campus resources, stratified by first-generation status and Pell eligibility. Assigned to the Program Evaluator; one week (first week of October 2026).

Objective 3.2

Evaluate equitable access and engagement outcomes at the close of each pilot semester.

Evaluation data must be disaggregated to determine whether the platform serves its target population. Aggregate results can mask disparities in access and engagement that persist even when overall program outcomes are positive. Two tasks carry out Objective 3.2.

Task 1: Analyze Gilead engagement data at the close of each pilot semester by first-generation status, Pell eligibility, and declared major; compare module completion rates, time-on-task, and writing assessment gains across student subgroups. Assigned to the Program Evaluator; two weeks per semester (December 2026 and June 2027).

Task 2: Compile and submit an equity report to the Principal Investigator after each semester; document engagement patterns, proficiency gains, and completion rates by subgroup with recommended program adjustments. Assigned to the Program Evaluator; three weeks after data collection closes (January 2027 and July 2027).

Table 4

Goal 3 Objectives and Tasks: Expand Equitable Access

Goal	Objective 3.1: Recruit Representative Pilot Cohort	Objective 3.2: Evaluate Access and Engagement Outcomes
Goal 3: Expand equitable access to sustained writing instruction for first-generation and underserved students within the LMS environments they already use. (ISTE Std. 6; Paris, 2012, Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy)	Task 1: Confirm 40% first-generation enrollment threshold across 6 pilot sections with the Office of Institutional Research; flag sections below threshold for outreach. Assigned to: Program Coordinator 2 weeks (Aug 2026) Task 2: Administer baseline survey to 120 pilot students on writing experience, comfort, and campus resource familiarity, stratified by first-generation status. Assigned to: Program Evaluator 1 week (first week of Oct 2026)	Task 1: Analyze end-of-semester Gilead engagement data by first-generation status, Pell eligibility, and major; identify completion rate and proficiency gain disparities across subgroups. Assigned to: Program Evaluator 2 weeks per semester (Dec 2026 & Jun 2027) Task 2: Compile and submit equity report to the PI with engagement patterns, proficiency gains, and recommended program adjustments. Assigned to: Program Evaluator 3 weeks after each semester (Jan 2027 & Jul 2027)

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluation Plan

Mixed-Methods Evaluation Framework

EVALUATION PLAN

The Academic Literacy Collaborative will implement a mixed-methods evaluation framework to monitor program progress and measure outcomes across the two-semester pilot year. The evaluation addresses three questions that correspond directly to the program's goals. First, does the Gilead platform strengthen writing proficiency among first-year and lower-division students? Second, does process-based documentation give instructors reliable evidence of student authorship? Third, do first-generation and underserved students engage with the platform at rates comparable to their continuing-generation peers, and do they demonstrate comparable proficiency gains? Each question derives from Goals 1, 2, and 3, respectively, and each will be answered using a triangulated data set collected across the pilot year.

The evaluation design draws on Chametzky's (2014) andragogic framework for technology-mediated learning. Chametzky argues that evaluation in digital learning contexts must move past performance metrics to assess whether learners experience the platform as purposeful and relevant to their development. The Gilead evaluation will capture both performance outcomes (writing assessment scores and module completion rates) and process-level indicators including student confidence, perceived ownership of the writing process, and the meaningfulness of staged feedback. This dual focus reflects the andragogic premise underlying the Gilead platform: that students learn to write not by encountering finished models but by moving through the composition process under guided, responsive instruction (Chametzky, 2014).

Three data collection methods will carry out the evaluation. Each addresses a distinct dimension of the program's intended outcomes, and together they produce triangulated evidence that strengthens the credibility of the program's conclusions. The Program Evaluator will lead all data collection and analysis, the Program Coordinator will manage scheduling and participant recruitment, and the Principal Investigator will review all reports and authorize dissemination.

Surveys

The first objective of the evaluation is to administer Likert-scale surveys to all 120 pilot students at three points: the first week of October 2026 (pre-program baseline), December 2026 (end of Semester 1), and June 2027 (end of Semester 2). Survey items will measure writing confidence, familiarity with the writing process, comfort with academic conventions, and perceived value of the Gilead platform. The pre-program survey will also collect demographic data, including first-generation status and Pell grant eligibility, to support the disaggregated equity analysis required by Goal 3. A brief instructor-facing survey will be administered mid-semester to capture faculty perceptions of student engagement and platform functionality. All surveys will be distributed through Canvas to ensure consistent access across all six pilot sections.

Instructor Interviews

The second objective is to conduct semi-structured interviews with all six pilot instructors at the midpoint of each semester (November 2026 and April 2027). The first set of interviews will address three areas: instructor observations of student engagement with the Gilead modules, instructor experience using process records in grading and integrity review, and recommendations for platform refinement. The second set, in April 2027, will revisit these same areas with the benefit of a full semester's additional experience. Each interview will run approximately 45 minutes. Transcripts will be coded thematically using a codebook developed before data collection begins. This methodology reflects best practice in program evaluation for education initiatives, where instructor perspective provides interpretive context that survey data alone cannot supply.

Student Focus Groups

The third objective is to facilitate student focus groups at the close of each pilot semester (December 2026 and June 2027). Task 1 of Objective 3.1 requires that the Program Coordinator recruit two cohorts of 8 to 10 students per semester, stratified by first-generation status to ensure adequate representation of the program's primary target population. Each session will run approximately 60 minutes and will be facilitated by the Program Evaluator using the prepared script in Appendix A. Focus groups provide qualitative depth that surveys cannot produce, particularly regarding student motivation, perceived access to support, and the experience of working through a staged writing process. All three dimensions sit central to evaluating Goal 3.

Reporting and Budget

The Program Evaluator will submit a written report to the Principal Investigator after each pilot semester, synthesizing quantitative survey data, interview themes, and focus group findings. The final evaluation report, due August 2027, will document program outcomes across all three goals and provide evidence-based recommendations for next-phase development. The evaluation budget is set at 10 percent of total direct program costs, consistent with standard practice for federally funded education program evaluation, and is detailed in the Budget Section. Sample evaluation instruments are provided in Appendix A.

Table 5*Evaluation Plan: Academic Literacy Collaborative Pilot Year (2026–2027)*

Evaluation Tasks	Phase 1: Jul–Aug 2026	Phase 2: Sep–Dec 2026	Phase 3: Jan–Mar 2027	Phase 4: Apr–Jun 2027
Instrument Development	Develop and test all evaluation instruments: student survey, interview protocol, focus group script (Aug 2026).			
Pre-Program Survey		Administer baseline survey to all 120 students: writing confidence, process familiarity, demographics (Week 1, Oct 2026).		
Instructor Interviews		Mid-semester interviews with 6 instructors on student engagement, integrity documentation, and platform functionality (Nov 2026).		Mid-semester interviews with 6 instructors (Apr 2027).
Student Focus Groups		Semester 1 focus groups: 2 cohorts of 8–10 students stratified by first-generation status (Dec 2026).		Semester 2 focus groups: 2 cohorts of 8–10 students (Jun 2027).
Post-Semester Surveys & Reporting			Administer Semester 1 post-survey; compile and submit Semester 1 evaluation report (Dec–Jan 2026–27).	Administer Semester 2 post-survey; submit final evaluation report (Jun–Aug 2027).

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



PROGRAM TEAM

Self-Care Plan

Sustaining Quality Engagement Across the Pilot Year

SELF-CARE PLAN

The team responsible for designing, launching, and running the Academic Literacy Collaborative includes five staff roles: the Principal Investigator, Instructional Designer, Platform Developer, Program Coordinator, and Program Evaluator. Each role carries sustained cognitive, logistical, and interpersonal demands across the full pilot year, from the intensive platform development work of Phase 1 through the data collection, analysis, and reporting cycles of Phase 4. A program that asks students to take deliberate ownership of their learning requires a team that is itself well-supported, reflective, and capable of maintaining high-quality engagement across two consecutive semesters.

Research supports intentional self-care as foundational to professional sustainability in education and program development contexts. Pryma and Briegel (2024) found that structured creative activities, particularly reflective journaling, reduced stress and improved the well-being of professionals engaged in demanding collaborative and pedagogical work. Their pilot study demonstrated that participants who engaged in regular creative reflection processed professional challenges more constructively, sustained higher levels of motivation, and reported greater confidence in their roles. These findings apply directly to the Academic Literacy Collaborative team, which will navigate the uncertainties of a novel technology deployment, the demands of coordinating six course sections across multiple disciplines, and the continuous work of data collection and program adjustment across the pilot year.

Writing as a form of self-care deserves particular attention for this program team. The Academic Literacy Collaborative rests on the premise that writing is a mode of thinking through which students develop understanding and build confidence in their own voice. That premise extends to the professionals who run the program. Team members who maintain a reflective writing practice develop firsthand understanding of the writing process they ask students to enter, which strengthens their capacity to interpret student experiences, refine platform design, and sustain pedagogical empathy across the pilot year. Pryma and Briegel (2024) describe how journaling helped participants organize their learning priorities and process the emotional weight of demanding professional work, an outcome that applies equally to a program team running a technology pilot in a live academic setting. Chametzky's (2014) identification of self-direction and empowerment as the central drivers of meaningful professional engagement further supports the design of this self-care plan: team members who feel supported, can voice concerns through structured channels, and have space for individual reflection are more likely to sustain the quality of engagement the pilot requires.

The self-care plan organizes four practices that will run in parallel with program implementation. The first practice is weekly reflective journaling: each team member will dedicate 20 minutes per

week to a private professional journal, documenting observations, decisions, and challenges as the program unfolds. The second practice is quarterly team check-in sessions: facilitated 90-minute meetings held at the close of each program phase, where team members share progress, surface concerns, and acknowledge one another's contributions. These sessions provide structured peer support and ensure the team responds to emerging challenges collectively. The third practice is scheduled physical movement during intensive work phases: during Phase 1 (platform development) and Phase 3 (full implementation), team members will schedule two 20-minute walking breaks per week to support cognitive renewal and reduce fatigue from sustained screen-based work. The fourth practice is professional reading and sharing: each team member will select one article per semester in their area of the program (instructional design, educational technology, writing pedagogy, program evaluation, or a related field) and share a brief summary at each quarterly check-in to sustain individual learning and prevent professional isolation.

Table 6

Self-Care Plan: Academic Literacy Collaborative Program Team (2026–2027)

Self-Care Activities	Phase 1: Jul–Aug 2026	Phase 2: Sep–Dec 2026	Phase 3: Jan–Mar 2027	Phase 4: Apr–Jun 2027
Reflective Journaling 20 min/week, private professional journal	Launch journaling practice; each team member begins a program journal.	Maintain weekly journaling throughout active pilot implementation.	Continue journaling; use entries to inform Semester 2 planning.	Final journal entries; reflect on full pilot experience.
Quarterly Team Check-In 90-min facilitated meeting at close of each phase	Q1: Review Phase 1 progress, surface concerns, set team agreements.	Q2: Mid-pilot review; share professional reading; acknowledge contributions.	Q3: Semester 1 debrief; adapt plan for Semester 2.	Q4: Celebrate pilot completion; document lessons learned.
Physical Movement Breaks Two 20-min walks/week during intensive phases	Schedule walking breaks during module development sprint.		Schedule walking breaks during full-implementation phase.	
Professional Reading and Sharing One article per semester; brief summary at quarterly check-in	Select Semester 1 reading during Phase 1.	Share Semester 1 reading summary at Q2 check-in.	Select Semester 2 reading during Phase 3.	Share Semester 2 reading summary at Q4 check-in.

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



PROGRAM FINANCE

Budget

Resource Plan and Cost Justification

BUDGET

Budget Narrative

The Academic Literacy Collaborative will request \$75,920 in total funding to design, build, and deliver the Gilead digital learning platform across six lower-division course sections at Mount St. Mary's University during the 2026–2027 pilot year. The budget will allocate funds across three categories: personnel hours required to design, develop, and deliver the program; materials and software needed to build and maintain the platform; and standard evaluation and indirect costs. The narrative below describes how funds will support each program goal and identifies the items that require the largest portion of the budget.

The program will engage personnel across three labor categories. Leadership Staff (LS) at \$100 per hour will include the Principal Investigator. Professional Staff (PS) at \$50 per hour will include the Instructional Designer, the Platform Developer, the Program Coordinator, and the Program Evaluator. Support Staff (SS) at \$25 per hour will handle data entry, file management, and administrative coordination across the pilot year. This structure reflects the actual labor mix the program requires: senior decision-making concentrated in a small number of hours, professional design and implementation work distributed across the program team, and administrative support sustained throughout the pilot.

Goal 1 will require the largest portion of the budget at \$30,900 in direct cost. The Instructional Designer will develop detailed storyboards across the first six weeks of Phase 1, which will specify learning objectives, student activities, and feedback prompts for each writing stage. The Platform Developer will then build and test the eight modules within Canvas, in collaboration with a five-member faculty review panel whose stipends sit under materials. Two three-hour faculty professional development sessions in late August will prepare six pilot instructors to use Gilead in their courses. Pre- and post-semester writing assessments will run across both pilot semesters, with faculty scoring stipends and rubric calibration included as material costs.

Goal 2 will fund the configuration and use of the platform's process-documentation tools at \$16,200 in direct cost. The Platform Developer will program keystroke logging, draft-progression tracking, and time-on-task recording across three weeks before the fall semester begins. The Principal Investigator will lead protocol development across four weeks in consultation with the Dean of Students and the academic integrity officer. The most expensive item under Goal 2 is the licensing for the integrity tools that the platform requires: keystroke biometric services, AI-content detection, and plagiarism scanning software, which together reach \$3,000 in materials. This investment is necessary because the program rests on Gilead's capacity to record student writing as it develops, and the platform cannot deliver this function without licensed third-party tools.

Goal 3 will support recruitment, evaluation, and reporting work at \$11,300 in direct cost. The Program Coordinator will coordinate with the Office of Institutional Research before the fall semester to verify the 40 percent first-generation enrollment threshold across the six pilot sections. The Program Evaluator will administer the baseline survey, analyze disaggregated engagement data at the close of each pilot semester, and compile the equity reports submitted to the Principal Investigator. Goal 3 requires less personnel time than Goals 1 and 2 because the work sits primarily within the Program Evaluator's role.

Several material items require justification within the budget. LMS integration tools and design software for the eight modules reach approximately \$1,800 across Goal 1 tasks. Process-documentation software (keystroke biometrics, AI-content detection, and plagiarism scanning) reaches approximately \$3,000 under Goal 2. Faculty stipends for the review panel, professional development participation, and rubric scoring total approximately \$7,800 across all three goals, distributed as material costs to recognize faculty time outside their regular teaching loads. Survey software, data analysis tools, and printing costs for protocol distribution round out the materials budget.

Total direct cost across the three program goals reaches \$58,400. Evaluation cost will run at 10 percent of direct cost (\$5,840), consistent with standard practice for federally funded education program evaluation. Indirect cost will run at 20 percent of direct cost (\$11,680), which will support office space, utilities, and administrative overhead at Mount St. Mary's University. Total project cost reaches \$75,920. The Summary Budget Table below compiles these figures by goal and objective. Appendix B provides the three cost justification tables that derive from the task-level estimates described in this narrative.

Table 7

Summary Budget Table: Academic Literacy Collaborative – Gilead Platform Pilot

Personnel Legend: LS = Leadership Staff @ \$100/hour | PS = Professional Staff @ \$50/hour | SS = Support Staff @ \$25/hour

Goal	Objectives	Personnel & Material Costs	Total
Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency	Obj. 1.1: Design and develop eight scaffolded writing modules. Obj. 1.2: Implement modules across six lower-division course sections.	LS (both objectives): \$1,800 PS (both objectives): \$21,500 SS (both objectives): \$1,250 Materials (LMS tools, faculty stipends, assessment software): \$6,350	\$30,900
Goal 1 Total			\$30,900

Goal	Objectives	Personnel & Material Costs	Total
Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity	Obj. 2.1: Configure process-documentation tools across all six pilot sections. Obj. 2.2: Develop and distribute the academic integrity protocol.	LS (both objectives): \$3,600 PS (both objectives): \$6,850 Materials (integrity software licenses, faculty stipends, printing): \$5,750	\$16,200
Goal 2 Total			\$16,200
Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access	Obj. 3.1: Recruit a representative pilot cohort with 40% first-generation enrollment. Obj. 3.2: Evaluate access and engagement outcomes at the close of each pilot semester.	LS (both objectives): \$2,000 PS (both objectives): \$6,850 SS (both objectives): \$825 Materials (survey software, data analysis tools, reports): \$1,625	\$11,300
Goal 3 Total			\$11,300
Total Direct Cost (Goals 1–3)			\$58,400
Evaluation Cost (10% of direct cost)			\$5,840
Indirect Cost (20% of direct cost)			\$11,680
TOTAL PROJECT COST			\$75,920

Note. Cost estimates derive from task-level hours and labor rates documented in Appendix B. Evaluation cost and indirect cost percentages reflect class assumptions (10 percent and 20 percent of direct cost, respectively).

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



APPENDIX A

Evaluation Instruments

Sample Surveys, Interview Protocols, and Focus Group Scripts

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

This appendix provides sample instruments for the three evaluation methods described in the Evaluation Plan. All instruments are working drafts subject to review by the Program Evaluator and a faculty advisory panel before deployment in October 2026.

A.1 Student Survey Items (Likert Scale)

Students respond on a five-point scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree. Additional demographic items collect first-generation status, Pell eligibility, and declared major to support disaggregated equity analysis.

Writing Confidence and Process

1. Before I begin writing an assignment, I know what steps to take to plan and organize my ideas.
2. I know how to develop a working thesis statement and refine it through multiple drafts.
3. Receiving feedback on early drafts helps me produce a stronger final submission.

Gilead Platform Engagement

4. Working through the Gilead writing modules helped me understand what my instructor expected before I submitted my assignment.
5. The stage-by-stage feedback in Gilead helped me revise my writing before advancing to the next step.
6. Using the Gilead platform made me feel more confident in my ability to write academic papers.
7. Gilead was easy to access within my Canvas course.

Equity and Access

8. I would have sought writing support on my own if Gilead had not been part of my course.
9. The writing support I received through Gilead was available at times and in formats that worked for my schedule.
10. I would recommend the Gilead writing modules to other students in lower-division courses.

A.2 Instructor Interview Protocol

Interviews are semi-structured and run approximately 45 minutes. The Program Evaluator will follow the sequence below while allowing participants to expand on emerging topics. All

interviews will be recorded with participant consent and transcribed for thematic analysis using a codebook developed before data collection begins.

Opening (5 minutes)

Describe generally how your students engaged with the Gilead platform this semester.

Probe: Were there particular modules where you observed stronger or weaker student engagement?

Probe: How did student engagement with Gilead compare to other course activities this semester?

Platform and Process Documentation (15 minutes)

In what ways, if any, did Gilead's process records change how you approached grading or responding to student writing?

Probe: Did the keystroke or draft-progression data give you information you would not otherwise have had?

Probe: Did you use process records to address an academic integrity concern this semester? If so, what was that experience like?

Student Outcomes and Equity (15 minutes)

Based on your observations this semester, did Gilead appear to support students who entered the course with weaker writing backgrounds?

Probe: Did you observe differences in how first-generation or Pell-eligible students engaged with the platform?

Probe: Were there students who struggled with the platform itself, separate from the writing tasks?

Recommendations (10 minutes)

What would you change about the Gilead platform or its integration in your course before the next semester?

Probe: Were there modules you would redesign, reorder, or remove?

Probe: Is there anything you wish the faculty training had covered that it did not?

A.3 Student Focus Group Script

Sessions run approximately 60 minutes. Two cohorts of 8 to 10 students per semester will be recruited, stratified by first-generation status. The Program Evaluator facilitates. Ground rules are reviewed at the opening: confidentiality, one speaker at a time, right to pass. Sessions will be recorded with participant consent.

Welcome and Ground Rules (5 minutes)

Thank you for being here. This conversation is part of our evaluation of the Gilead writing platform. Everything you share will remain confidential; we will not connect your name to any specific comment in our reports. There are no right or wrong answers. Your experience with the platform matters, and we want to understand it.

Warm-Up (5 minutes)

Tell us your first name and one word that describes how you felt about academic writing at the beginning of this semester.

Core Discussion Questions (40 minutes)

1. Walk us through how you typically worked through a Gilead module. What did that process feel like?

Probe: Was there a stage where you learned the most? A stage that felt less useful?

2. Did working through Gilead change how you thought about or approached your essays and papers? How?

Probe: Did you find yourself doing anything differently in your writing because of how the modules were structured?

3. Before this semester, how likely were you to seek writing support on your own; for example, visiting the writing center or asking a professor for extra help?

Probe: Did Gilead feel like a resource you would have found on your own if it had not been built into your course? Why or why not?

4. If you could change one thing about the Gilead platform, what would it be?

Closing (10 minutes)

Is there anything about your experience with Gilead this semester that we have not covered? Anything you wish we had asked? Thank you. Your feedback will directly shape how the program develops in the next semester and beyond.

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



APPENDIX B

Budget Cost Justification

Task-Level Cost Estimates for Goals 1, 2, and 3

APPENDIX B: BUDGET COST JUSTIFICATION

Appendix B provides three cost justification tables, one for each program goal. Each table breaks every objective into its component tasks and estimates the labor hours and material costs that the task requires. Hourly rates reflect the three labor categories used throughout the budget: Leadership Staff (LS) at \$100 per hour, Professional Staff (PS) at \$50 per hour, and Support Staff (SS) at \$25 per hour. Goal totals from these tables transfer directly to the Summary Budget Table in the Budget Section.

Table B-1

Cost Justification for Goal 1: Strengthen Writing Proficiency

Personnel Legend: LS = Leadership Staff @ \$100/hour | PS = Professional Staff @ \$50/hour | SS = Support Staff @ \$25/hour

Objective	Task	WHO (hours × rate)	Materials	Cost
Obj. 1.1 Design and develop eight scaffolded writing modules.	Task 1: Develop instructional storyboards for all eight Gilead modules; specify learning objectives, student activities, and embedded feedback prompts.	Instructional Designer (PS): 150 hrs × \$50 = \$7,500 Principal Investigator (LS): 8 hrs × \$100 = \$800 Support Staff (SS): 20 hrs × \$25 = \$500	Design software licenses: \$400 Storyboard templates and reference materials: \$300	\$9,500
	Task 2: Build the eight modules in Canvas and conduct user-acceptance testing with a five-member faculty review panel before the fall launch.	Platform Developer (PS): 120 hrs × \$50 = \$6,000 Instructional Designer (PS): 60 hrs × \$50 = \$3,000 Principal Investigator (LS): 6 hrs × \$100 = \$600	Faculty review panel stipends: 5 × \$300 = \$1,500 LMS integration tools and testing accounts: \$800	\$11,900
	Obj. 1.1 Subtotal			\$21,400
Obj. 1.2 Implement Gilead modules across six pilot course sections.	Task 1: Facilitate two three-hour faculty professional development sessions for six pilot instructors.	Program Coordinator (PS): 20 hrs × \$50 = \$1,000 Principal Investigator (LS): 4 hrs × \$100 = \$400	Faculty PD stipends: 6 × \$150 = \$900 Workshop materials and printed handouts: \$200	\$2,500

Objective	Task	WHO (hours × rate)	Materials	Cost
	Task 2: Administer pre- and post-semester writing assessments to 120 pilot students using a shared analytic rubric across both pilot semesters.	Program Evaluator (PS): 80 hrs × \$50 = \$4,000 Support Staff (SS): 30 hrs × \$25 = \$750	Faculty rubric scoring stipends: 6 instructors × 2 semesters × \$150 = \$1,800 Assessment software and printing: \$450	\$7,000
Obj. 1.2 Subtotal				\$9,500
Total Cost for Goal 1				\$30,900

Note. Goal 1 reflects the largest budget allocation in the program because it funds module design, platform construction, faculty training, and student assessment across both pilot semesters.

Table B-2

Cost Justification for Goal 2: Support Academic Integrity

Personnel Legend: LS = Leadership Staff @ \$100/hour | PS = Professional Staff @ \$50/hour | SS = Support Staff @ \$25/hour

Objective	Task	WHO (hours × rate)	Materials	Cost
Obj. 2.1 Configure process-documentation tools across all six pilot sections.	Task 1: Program keystroke logging, draft-progression tracking, and time-on-task recording within Gilead before fall semester submissions begin.	Platform Developer (PS): 90 hrs × \$50 = \$4,500 Principal Investigator (LS): 5 hrs × \$100 = \$500	Keystroke biometric license: \$1,500 AI-content detection license: \$1,000 Plagiarism scanning license: \$500	\$8,000
	Task 2: Educate six pilot instructors in reading and interpreting Gilead process records through a two-hour workshop.	Program Coordinator (PS): 15 hrs × \$50 = \$750 Principal Investigator (LS): 2 hrs × \$100 = \$200	Faculty workshop stipends: 6 × \$100 = \$600 Workshop materials: \$150	\$1,700
Obj. 2.1 Subtotal				\$9,700
Obj. 2.2 Develop and distribute the academic integrity protocol.	Task 1: Draft the academic integrity protocol in consultation with the Dean of Students and the academic integrity officer.	Principal Investigator (LS): 25 hrs × \$100 = \$2,500 Program Coordinator (PS): 20 hrs × \$50 = \$1,000	Legal and policy consultation fees: \$1,500 Reference materials: \$300	\$5,300
	Task 2: Present the completed protocol at a Faculty Senate meeting and distribute it to all department chairs in the six pilot disciplines.	Program Coordinator (PS): 12 hrs × \$50 = \$600 Principal Investigator (LS): 4 hrs × \$100 = \$400	Printing and distribution materials: \$200	\$1,200
Obj. 2.2 Subtotal				\$6,500
Total Cost for Goal 2				\$16,200

Note. Goal 2 carries proportionately higher material costs than Goals 1 and 3 because the program licenses three third-party tools required for keystroke biometrics, AI-content detection, and plagiarism scanning. These licenses underwrite the platform's capacity to document student writing as it develops.

Table B-3

Cost Justification for Goal 3: Expand Equitable Access

Personnel Legend: LS = Leadership Staff @ \$100/hour | PS = Professional Staff @ \$50/hour | SS = Support Staff @ \$25/hour

Objective	Task	WHO (hours × rate)	Materials	Cost
Obj. 3.1 Recruit a representative pilot cohort with 40% first-generation enrollment.	Task 1: Coordinate with the Office of Institutional Research and First-Generation Student Success Program to verify enrollment thresholds across six pilot sections.	Program Coordinator (PS): 15 hrs × \$50 = \$750 Principal Investigator (LS): 4 hrs × \$100 = \$400 Support Staff (SS): 10 hrs × \$25 = \$250	Enrollment data reports and outreach materials: \$200	\$1,600
	Task 2: Administer a baseline survey to 120 pilot students in the first week of class, stratified by first-generation status and Pell eligibility.	Program Evaluator (PS): 12 hrs × \$50 = \$600 Support Staff (SS): 8 hrs × \$25 = \$200	Survey software subscription: \$300 Printing and distribution: \$100	\$1,200
Obj. 3.1 Subtotal				\$2,800
Obj. 3.2 Evaluate access and engagement outcomes at the close of each pilot semester.	Task 1: Analyze Gilead engagement data by first-generation status, Pell eligibility, and declared major across both pilot semesters.	Program Evaluator (PS): 60 hrs × \$50 = \$3,000 Principal Investigator (LS): 8 hrs × \$100 = \$800	Data analysis software license: \$700	\$4,500
	Task 2: Compile and submit equity reports to the Principal Investigator after each semester documenting engagement, proficiency gains, and recommended adjustments.	Program Evaluator (PS): 50 hrs × \$50 = \$2,500 Principal Investigator (LS): 8 hrs × \$100 = \$800 Support Staff (SS): 15 hrs × \$25 = \$375	Report formatting, printing, and distribution: \$325	\$4,000
Obj. 3.2 Subtotal				\$8,500
Total Cost for Goal 3				\$11,300

Note. Goal 3 carries the smallest direct-cost total of the three goals because the work concentrates within the Program Evaluator role and uses survey and analysis tools the program already licenses under Goals 1 and 2.

Reconciliation with Summary Budget Table

The three goal totals (Goal 1 = \$30,900; Goal 2 = \$16,200; Goal 3 = \$11,300) sum to \$58,400 in direct cost, which the Summary Budget Table reports as Total Direct Cost. Evaluation cost (10

percent) adds \$5,840. Indirect cost (20 percent) adds \$11,680. Total Project Cost reaches \$75,920.

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



APPENDIX C

AI Disclosure Statement

Transparent Use of AI in Proposal Development

APPENDIX C: AI DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

This appendix documents the use of AI in producing this grant proposal. The table below itemizes AI use by proposal section. The reflection that follows discusses the value and pitfalls of AI in producing intellectual material, drawing on specific examples from this project.

Table 8

AI Disclosure Statement: Use of AI by Proposal Section

Proposal Section	Description of Use of AI (☒ checked items apply)
Introduction (4–5 pages)	☒ AI used to generate some general ideas ☐ AI developed some or all of my 3 goals ☒ AI used to "polish" my writing ☐ AI generated the writing, which I "paraphrased and polished" ☐ Other
Goal 1 (2–3 pages)	☒ AI used to generate some general ideas ☐ AI developed my 1st goal ☐ AI developed some or all of my 2 objectives ☒ AI developed some or all of my tasks associated with 2 objectives ☒ AI used to "polish" my writing in this section ☐ AI generated the writing, which I "paraphrased and polished" ☐ Other
Goal 2 (2–3 pages)	☒ AI used to generate some general ideas ☐ AI developed my 2nd goal ☐ AI developed some or all of my 2 objectives ☒ AI developed some or all of my tasks associated with 2 objectives ☒ AI used to "polish" my writing in this section ☐ AI generated the writing, which I "paraphrased and polished" ☐ Other
Goal 3 (2–3 pages)	☒ AI used to generate some general ideas ☐ AI developed my 3rd goal ☐ AI developed some or all of my 2 objectives ☒ AI developed some or all of the tasks associated with 2 objectives ☒ AI used to "polish" my writing in this section ☐ AI generated the writing, which I "paraphrased and polished" ☐ Other
Evaluation Plan (1–2 pages)	☒ AI used to generate some general ideas ☐ AI developed some or all of my evaluation methods (e.g., surveys) ☒ AI used to "polish" my writing ☐ AI generated the writing, which I "paraphrased and polished" ☐ Other

Proposal Section	Description of Use of AI (☑ checked items apply)
Self-Care Plan (1–2 pages)	☐ AI used to generate some general ideas ☐ AI developed some or all of my self-care plan ☒ AI used to "polish" my writing ☐ AI generated the writing, which I "paraphrased and polished" ☐ Other
Appendix A – Evaluation Examples	☒ AI provided specific evaluation items (e.g., Likert items)
Design Features (e.g., Logo)	☐ AI provided significant design help for logo (Canva template predates AI use in this project)

Note. ☑ indicates use that applies; ☐ indicates use that does not apply. The reflection on the following page addresses the value and pitfalls of AI in producing this proposal.

REFLECTION ON AI USE

The decision to use AI in producing this grant proposal forced a daily question: where does editing end and authorship dissolve? My disclosure marks the choices. The three program goals, the objectives under each goal, the evaluation methods, and the self-care plan came from my own thinking and reading. AI revised objectives that Doug flagged as too lengthy, broke objectives into task-level work where I lacked institutional knowledge of how university grant programs run, generated budget figures I had no basis to estimate, contributed Likert items that I revised in Appendix A, and polished prose throughout. That distribution matters because the value and the pitfalls of AI in this kind of work fall along that line.

The value is real when the writer brings a foundation. I learned writing through years of reading literature and theory, through tutoring undergraduates at the Wilson College Writing Center, through editing my own poetry. When AI tightened an objective from twenty-eight words to fourteen, I could read the revision and judge whether the verb still carried the work, whether the sentence pointed at students instead of at processes, whether the cuts had stripped the meaning out or only the fat. That judgment is not transferable. Without it, "polish my writing" becomes "replace my writing with a smoother version," and the writer loses the ability to tell the difference. The students I tutored at Wilson submitted AI-drafted papers and asked the writing center to help them sound human. They could not see the uniform paragraph structure, the soft transitional verbs, the bloom of em dashes that now signals AI prose. I have stopped using em dashes after years of treating them as part of my voice; the semicolon has come back into my drafts, and that small loss has clarified what is at stake.

The pitfall lies on the same line in reverse. The moment AI moves past editing into generation, authorship begins to dissolve. A grammar correction or a word swap that preserves the writer's voice belongs in the editor's role. A paragraph rewritten in AI's smoother register, even from the writer's own ideas, is no longer the writer's prose. I held that line by using AI through targeted requests: highlight every adverb so I can decide each one, identify weak transitions, evaluate whether my thesis meets standard criteria, act as a copyeditor and flag what needs work. Each request produces a list. Each item on the list is a decision I make. The writing remains mine because the choices remain mine.

What concerns me most as a future instructional designer is how AI reshapes the conditions under which students develop writing at all. Writing is a slow form of thinking, a way of working out what one believes by putting it into words. It is also an exposure of the self, a willingness to be read. If undergraduates outsource that process before they have built the foundation that lets them see what they are outsourcing, the skill never develops, and education points toward utility, away from the pursuit of knowledge. The Gilead program this proposal funds keeps that process visible and supported. Writing this proposal taught me that the same principle applies to my own use of AI: the tool serves the foundation; it cannot replace it.

THE ACADEMIC LITERACY COLLABORATIVE

Supported by the Gilead Digital Learning Platform



REFERENCES

References

Sources Cited Throughout the Proposal

REFERENCES

- Acien, A., Morales, A., Vera-Rodriguez, R., & Fierrez, J. (2021). TypeNet: Scaling up keystroke biometrics. In Proceedings of the IEEE International Joint Conference on Biometrics. IEEE.
- Aspen Institute. (2022). Gateway course success and student completion. Aspen Institute College Excellence Program.
<https://www.aspeninstitute.org/programs/college-excellence-program/>
- Chametzky, B. (2014). Andragogy and engagement in online learning: Tenets and solutions. *Creative Education*, 5, 813–821. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.510095>
- CWPA, NCTE, & NWP. (2011). Framework for success in postsecondary writing. Council of Writing Program Administrators. <http://wpacouncil.org/framework>
- Frederick, M. (2024). EdTech tools for student assignments. Center for the Advancement of Teaching Excellence, University of Illinois Chicago.
<https://teaching.uic.edu/cate-teaching-guides/digital-learning/edtech-tools-for-student-assignments/>
- Hamari, J., Koivisto, J., & Sarsa, H. (2014). Does gamification work? A literature review of empirical studies on gamification. In Proceedings of the 47th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (pp. 3025–3034). IEEE.
- ISTE. (2016). ISTE standards for students. International Society for Technology in Education.
<https://www.iste.org/standards/iste-standards-for-students>
- MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- McLeod, S., & Miraglia, E. (2001). Writing across the curriculum in a time of change. In S. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium* (pp. 1–27). National Council of Teachers of English.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93–97.
- Pryma, P. A., & Briegel, M. (2024). Student self-care and mental health well-being through creative art and art journaling: Facilitating self-care opportunities through creative art for students in the helping professions. *Creative Education*, 15, 503–511.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2024.154030>
- Rosenshine, B. (2012). Principles of instruction: Research-based strategies that all teachers should know. *American Educator*, 36(1), 12–19.

Stephens, N. M., Hamedani, M. G., & Destin, M. (2014). Closing the social-class achievement gap: A difference-education intervention improves first-generation students' academic performance and all students' well-being. *Psychological Science*, 25(4), 943–953.