EDITORIAL
Volume 9 No. 2

Making learning design explicit and shareable

The five papers in this issue of the Journal of Learning Design attempt to tidy up the messiness of learning design. They enact the objective suggested by Conole and Wills (2013) that learning design should make the design process itself "more explicit and shareable" (as cited in Rankin, Haggis, Luzeckyj and Gare, *this issue*, p. 15). Removing the messiness is an important first step to sharing practice in clear unambiguous ways.

This issue
The first paper in this issue is by **Lloyd** and **Bahr**, the editors of the *Journal of Learning Design.*
It is a reflective piece, a companion to our 10-year issue (Volume 8, No. 3, December 2015), which looks at the recurring motifs of learning design identified through the keywords of the Journal's articles published between 2005 and 2015. While acknowledging the interdependence of many themes (motifs) of learning design, the article singles out blended learning and authentic learning for particular attention. By categorising the motifs into more cohesive wholes, this paper makes its contribution to making learning design more explicit and shareable.

The second paper, by **Rankin, Haggis, Luzeckyj** and **Gare**, provides a systematic insider view on curriculum design. It interrogates the notion of "messy" design and argues that dealing with messiness is not in itself messy. It is, rather, neither ill-structured nor ill-defined. It is this paper and its stated aim to look for order within seeming chaos that gives this issue of the Journal its overarching theme. This paper is well-grounded in the research literature, for example, relating to pedagogical patterns (Goodyear, 2005) and transition pedagogy to meet the needs of first-year students (Kift, 2009). The authors draw on the observation of that "[learning] "design is a messy, creative, interactive practice grounded in real-life contexts" (Conole & Wills, 2013, p. 96).

The third paper in this issue, by **Seifert**, can also be seen to fit with the theme of making learning design more explicit by taking a systematic look at social media and how, although "not designed for the field of education" (Seifert, *this issue,* p. 310), it can be used in learning. The messiness is brought to order here by benchmarking against published frameworks, namely, Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) Taxonomy (a revision of Bloom's Taxonomy), Puentedura's (2006) SAMR Model (Substitution, Augmentation, Modification and Redefinition), and Churches' (2009) Communication Spectrum (a version of Bloom's Taxonomy updated to include online learning).

The fourth paper, by **Taljaard**, brings clarity to an area which appears messy because of the speed with which the multi-sensory technologies it describes are changing and impacting on teaching and learning. Taljaard concludes that multi-sensory approaches will bring us back to Dewey's (1916) philosophies of learning, specifically in terms of hands-on and concrete engagement.

The fifth and final paper in this issue, by **Burton** offers a way to bring order to student observations of complex and dynamic settings, here a court room. Burton's solution is to provide students with a

template – an observation schedule – to help them see fundamental patterns in a real-time high-stakes experience. This paper also argues for a situation where students develop their own templates to suit the circumstances of the court case they are observing.

Each paper in this issue shares transferable knowledge and experience from different disciplines and sectors. The authors have analysed their practice in systematic ways, replacing messiness with clarity and order, and sharing this with you. We commend the issue to you and hope that you not only enjoy reading it, but that the ideas and recommendations find resonance within your own practice.

Margaret Lloyd, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
Nan Bahr, Griffith University, Australia

References
Anderson, L.W., & Krathwohl, D. (Eds.) (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
Churches, A. (2009). *Bloom's digital taxonomy*. Retrieved from http://burtonslifelearning.pbworks.com/f/BloomDigitalTaxonomy2001.pdf

Conole, G., & Wills, S. (2013). Representing learning designs – Making design explicit and shareable. *Educational Media International, 50*(1), 1-13. Retrieved from http://ro.uow.edu.au/asdpapers/405

Goodyear, P. (2005). Educational design and networked learning: Patterns, pattern languages and design practice. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *21*(1), 82-101. Retrieved from http://ajet.org.au/index.php/AJET/article/download/1344/714

Kift, S. (2009). *Articulating a transition pedagogy to scaffold and to enhance the first year student learning experience in Australian higher education*. Final Report for ALTC Senior Fellowship Program. Retrieved from http://fyhe.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Kift-Sally-ALTC-Senior-Fellowship-Report-Sep-092.pdf

Puentedura, R. R. (2010). *SAMR and TPCK: Intro to advanced practice*. Retrieved from http://hippasus.com/resources/sweden2010/SAMR_TPCK_IntroToAdvancedPractice.pdf

Puentedura, R. R. (2014). *SAMR: A contextualized introduction*. Retrieved from http://hippasus.com/rrpweblog/archives/2014/01/15/SAMRABriefContextualizedIntroduction.pdf