ASCILITE 2025

Future-Focused:

Educating in an Era of Continuous Change

Partnering for practice: Using the RISE learning framework to design digital learning with intent

Heather Hotaling, Emma Knight, Kylie Butler
Risepoint

The RISE learning framework was developed to address a persistent gap in online learning design: the disconnect between pedagogical theory and practice. While social constructivist principles emphasise active engagement, formative feedback and alignment, many digital courses continue to rely heavily on passive content delivery. RISE (Relevant, Interactive, Structured, Engaging) offers a practical, discipline-agnostic conceptual tool that supports academics and learning designers in co-creating purposeful, student-centred online learning experiences. Unlike traditional activity-type taxonomies, RISE clearly distinguishes between passive (acquisition) and active (application) tasks, emphasising alignment with learning outcomes and the integration of formative feedback. It promotes the inclusion of collaborative learning experiences, recognising the value of peer interaction in fostering engagement and supporting learning outcomes, and foregrounds authenticity by encouraging the design of learning that reflects professional practice and builds industry-relevant capabilities.

This poster introduces the conceptual foundations and development of the RISE learning framework, explores its use in collaborative course design, and outlines our plan to evaluate its use through a structured survey capturing academic and learning designer perspectives. Findings from this evaluation will inform future refinements to the framework.

Keywords: online learning design, active learning, formative feedback, authentic learning, collaborative course development, constructive alignment, third space professionals.

References

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

Ashford-Rowe, K., Herrington, J., & Brown, C. (2014). Establishing the critical elements that determine authentic assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(2), 205–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.819566

Biggs, J., Tang, C., & Kennedy, G. (2022). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38*(6), 698–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462

Carless, D. (2017). Feedback as dialogue. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory* (pp. 1–6). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-588-4_389

Chi, M. T. H., & Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. *Educational Psychologist, 49*(4), 219–243. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2014.965823

Conole, G. (2013). *Designing for learning in an open world*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-8517-0

Huijser, H., Doherty, I., & Willems, J. (2024). Upskilling academics for Gen AI: The role of third space workers. In Cochrane, T., Narayan, V., Bone, E., Deneen, C., Saligari, M., Tregloan, K., Vanderburg, R. (Eds.), *Navigating the Terrain: Emerging frontiers in learning spaces, pedagogies, and technologies*. Proceedings ASCILITE 2024. Melbourne (pp. 658-663). https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2024.1509

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education, 2*(2–3), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(3), 67–86. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504676

Herrington, J., Reeves, T. C., & Oliver, R. (2010). *A guide to authentic e-learning*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203864265

Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.

McIntosh, E., & Nutt, D. (Eds.). (2022). *The impact of the integrated practitioner in higher education: Studies in third space professionalism*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003037569

Open University. (2021). *OU learning design activity types framework*. https://www.open.ac.uk/blogs/learning-design/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/OU-LD-Activity-Types-Framework-October-2021-FINAL.pdf

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Walmsley-Smith, H., Machin, L., & Walton, G. (2019). The e-design assessment tool: An evidence-informed approach towards a consistent terminology for quantifying online distance learning activities. *Research in Learning Technology, 27*, Article 2106. https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v27.2106

Webster, H. (2022). Supporting the development, recognition, and impact of third space professionals. In E. McIntosh & D. Nutt (Eds.), *The impact of the integrated practitioner in higher education: Studies in third space professionalism* (pp. 235–246). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003037569-22

Whitchurch, C. (2008). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of *third space* professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 377–396. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00387.x

Hotaling, H., Knight, E., & Butler, K. (2025, Nov 30 – Dec 3). Partnering for practice: Using the RISE learning framework to design digital learning with intent [Poster Presentation]. Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education Conference, Adelaide, Australia. https://doi.org/10.65106/apubs.2025.2710