A Student Experience Framework for K-12 EdTech

A strategic design framework on what genuine student engagement actually requires, and why most edtech platforms don’t build for it.

Jesi Loredo · Sr. Product Design Manager

Executive Summary

- Student engagement is one of the strongest growth levers most K-12 edtech platforms have, and most are not actually pulling it.
- The typical organizational pattern: every product team solves student experience alone, with no shared framework, producing disconnected, inconsistent experiences across a portfolio.
- The root problem is not UX or gamification. Disengagement is a psychological and emotional condition that operates upstream of any feature a team could build.
- This framework is grounded in motivation science, honest about developmental differences across K-12 age bands, extensible with AI, and measured by something more meaningful than a “mark as complete” button.
- The centerpiece is a structured, cross-functional workshop methodology for building shared design pillars across a product portfolio, rather than each team reinventing the approach in isolation.

The Problem Most Edtech Platforms Don’t Solve

Across the edtech industry, student engagement is one of the strongest levers for platform growth and retention. Districts pay for far more software than students actually use: an analysis of 275 schools found that two-thirds of purchased software licenses went unused (Glimpse K12, 2019). And as budgets tighten, district leaders are prioritizing impact over volume and demanding evidence of value from every tool they adopt (LearnPlatform by Instructure, 2025). Yet the actual day-to-day student experience on most platforms remains passive, disconnected, and difficult to measure. When every product team solves this problem independently, the organizational cost becomes visible over time: siloed experiences, half-shipped student-facing features, and no shared understanding of what genuine engagement even looks like.

Student engagement is not a UX problem or a gamification problem. It is a psychological and emotional condition that operates upstream of any feature a team could build. Designing for it requires a framework grounded in motivation science, honest about the differences between K-12 age groups, extensible with AI as a personalization and emotional-intelligence layer, and measured by something more meaningful than a completion button.

The mechanisms most platforms rely on to know whether a student has actually engaged with learning are remarkably thin: a click on “mark as complete,” a teacher manually grading a submission, mastery signals that exist but rarely surface in a way that’s meaningful to educators or students in the moment. Across all of these, the deeper question goes unanswered: was the student genuinely curious, genuinely engaged, genuinely present? Most platforms are measuring compliance and completion and treating them as proxies for something they cannot actually tell us.

> *We do not have a content problem. We have an experience problem, and it is costing platforms more than they are currently measuring.*

The Insight Most Platforms Aren't Starting From

Here is what most edtech companies get wrong: student engagement is treated as a UX problem, a gamification problem, or a content quality problem. Badges, progress bars, and better video production get proposed as solutions.

None of these interventions address the actual mechanism by which students disengage. **Research in educational psychology is consistent on this point: disengagement is an emotional and psychological condition before it is a behavioral one.** Pekrun's Control-Value Theory of Achievement Emotions (2006) established that negative emotional states like boredom, anxiety, and hopelessness are antecedents of disengagement, not just symptoms of it. A 2021 meta-analysis (Camacho-Morles, Slemp, Pekrun et al.) found that these emotions are consistently linked to academic performance, which fits the theory's account of how they affect the motivational, self-regulatory, and cognitive processes learning depends on, well before any behavioral signal a platform could observe or measure. A badge system cannot reach what is happening at that level. Neither can a better progress bar. The root cause requires a design response that starts from a fundamentally different place.

In other words:

A student who is anxious does not explore. A student who feels unseen does not come back. A student who cannot find themselves in the content never connects.

These are not edge cases. They are the default emotional state for a substantial portion of K-12 students, particularly in middle and high school, where research consistently shows that intrinsic motivation for school declines sharply as students advance through the educational system (Ryan & Deci, 2020). They are also largely invisible in how most platforms currently design and measure the student experience.

Engagement is a psychological condition before it is a product feature. That should be the starting point that changes how a platform designs for students, and it's the starting point most edtech companies are uniquely positioned to build from, given the right investment and the right framework.

What Actually Drives Sustained Student Engagement

Building on established research in motivation psychology, learning science, and adolescent development, the following six drivers form the theoretical foundation of this framework. Importantly, these drivers are not equally effective across age groups, and any serious framework must be honest about that distinction.

1. The Open Loop: Unfinished Business Pulls People Back

Bluma Zeigarnik's foundational 1927 research demonstrated that people remember and return to unfinished tasks with significantly greater motivation than completed ones, a phenomenon now called the **Zeigarnik Effect**. More recent meta-analysis (2025) confirms that while the memory advantage is nuanced, the tendency to resume unfinished tasks is robust and consistent. The practical implication for product design is significant: experiences designed as episodic journeys, with a next chapter always waiting, generate return behavior that self-contained lessons cannot.

2. Curiosity as a Designed Condition

George Loewenstein's Information Gap Theory (1994) establishes that curiosity arises specifically when a person becomes aware of a **gap between what they know and what they want to know**. The gap creates genuine cognitive discomfort, a "knowledge itch," that motivates active engagement to resolve it. Neuroscience research (Gruber et al., 2014) confirms that curious states activate the brain's dopamine reward pathways, and that information encountered during a curious state is retained significantly better than information delivered without that activation.

The design implication is that curiosity is not a personality trait to be hoped for, it is a condition that can be deliberately manufactured through experience design. Starting with a question rather than an answer, revealing information progressively, and ensuring students know just enough to know they do not yet know everything, are all actionable design principles that can be built into a student experience layer.

3. Identity Progression Over Achievement Scoring

Research on academic identity consistently finds that students, particularly adolescents, are significantly more motivated by experiences that connect to who they are and who they are becoming than by external achievement markers like scores and grades (Graham & Anderson, 2008; Oyserman et al., 2017). Identity-Based Motivation Theory further establishes that for learning to feel meaningful, students must perceive a connection between their current identity and their future possible selves.

For K-5, this manifests as character identification and narrative role ("you are the explorer, the scientist, the guardian"). For 9-12, it manifests as career relevance framed through personal narrative: not "here are jobs that exist" but "here is a real problem someone in this field is solving, what would you do?"

4. Social Presence, Carefully Designed

Festinger's Social Comparison Theory (1954) and subsequent research establish that social context is a powerful motivator, students are naturally oriented toward understanding how their experience relates to others'. Upward comparison (seeing what peers have explored or discovered) can drive aspiration and motivation. Downward comparison, however, can undermine self-esteem and increase anxiety (Nesi & Prinstein, 2015).

This is territory that requires deliberate design and administrator controls. The goal is social presence, a sense that the platform is alive with learner activity, without social pressure. The distinction between "twelve students discovered the mystery object this week, are you ready to start looking?" versus "twelve students found it and you have not" is not subtle. One creates curiosity and invitation. The other creates shame. A well-designed platform builds the former, with on/off settings and controls for schools with concerns about social features entirely.

5. Autonomy, Competence, and Relatedness

Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), the most empirically validated motivation framework in psychology, identifies three fundamental psychological needs whose satisfaction drives intrinsic motivation: autonomy (a sense of genuine choice and ownership), competence (a felt sense of growing capability), and relatedness (a sense of connection to others and to the material). When these needs are supported, students are intrinsically motivated. When they are thwarted, motivation and wellbeing decline.

In practice, autonomy means genuine choice architecture, not "pick A or B" but meaningful pathways that feel owned by the student. Competence means visible felt progress that is not anxiety-inducing, a map that fills in, a collection that grows, a sense of accumulating knowledge over time. Relatedness means content that reflects students' lived experiences and identities, and an AI layer that asks good questions rather than just delivering answers.

6. Novelty and Seasonal Relevance

Return behavior in digital platforms is fundamentally driven by the expectation that something new will be there. Seasonal content drops, real-world event connections, and periodic discovery moments ("there was a major scientific discovery this week, here's what's on it") give students a reason to check in that is independent of assigned work. This is the engagement model that streaming platforms have built entire retention strategies around, and it is directly applicable to any content platform with sufficient depth. Seasonal missions, limited-time explorations, and timely content surfacing are high-impact, relatively low-cost features, and they give teachers an easy hook for bringing students back organically.

A Framework Honest About Age

One of the most consequential mistakes in edtech engagement design is applying a single model across K-12. The psychological profile, social context, and motivational drivers of a second grader and a tenth grader are not simply different in degree, they are different in philosophy. Any serious student experience framework must be explicit about this.

K-5: Wonder, Narrative, and Joyful Discovery. For younger students, an episodic, narrative-driven framework is the right foundation. Multi-week journeys, character companions, reward mechanics, and sequential discovery all map directly to the developmental needs and engagement drivers of this age group. An AI companion at this level should be warm, approachable, and character-driven, a guide that asks simple but genuinely curious questions and celebrates exploration.

- Design principle: make the world feel alive and expanding. Every session should offer something that was not there before.
- Engagement driver: open loops + novelty + joyful rewards.
- AI tone: friendly, simple language, character-embodied, developmentally accessible.

6-8: Identity, Agency, and Low-Stakes Exploration. This is the hardest age group in all of edtech, and the one most often designed for poorly. Students at this stage are acutely aware of what feels “babyish,” intensely focused on social dynamics and self-concept, and experiencing a well-documented decline in intrinsic motivation for school. Overt gamification, character mascots, and coin rewards cause immediate disengagement.

What works here is identity relevance, genuine agency, and carefully controlled social presence. Content framing should be peer-level and real-world. The experience should feel like a thinking space, not a game. An AI layer at this level should shift register: more conversational, more questioning, less character-driven.

- Design principle: treat students as capable of handling complexity. Don’t condescend.
- Engagement driver: identity progression + social presence (controlled) + autonomy.
- AI tone: mature, peer-adjacent, curious; asks genuine questions without being patronizing.

9-12: Real Stakes, Real Agency, Real Narrative. For high school students, the engagement model looks almost nothing like a points-and-badges system. What works is genuine relevance to who they are becoming, real-world problem framing, and a felt sense of intellectual growth over time. Career relevance framed through personal narrative, “your story, your journey,” grounded in established career development frameworks including Social Cognitive Career Theory, Krumboltz’s Happenstance Learning Theory, and Super’s Life-Span theory, demonstrates what this can look like in practice.

- Design principle: connect learning to identity and future self. Make the stakes feel real without creating performance anxiety.
- Engagement driver: identity progression + autonomy + novelty (real-world connection).
- AI tone: adult-adjacent, intellectually serious, acts as a thinking partner rather than a guide.

AI as the Experience Layer, Not a Chatbot

What’s proposed here is a student-facing AI experience layer that makes artificial intelligence contextually present throughout the student journey, rather than confined to a standalone search or chat interface. This experience layer shows up when it matters, speaks in a register that matches the student’s developmental stage, and always reaches for platform-native resources first.

Critically, this is not a single implementation. An edtech portfolio typically spans content-rich platforms, adaptive mastery engines, and products built from scratch. AI plays a different but consistent role across all of them: the psychological framework stays the same, the mechanism adapts to the product context.

What the AI layer actually does:

- **Contextual presence during learning.** The AI does not interrupt; it surfaces when a student appears stuck, has been idle, or has just completed a meaningful step. It asks a question rather than offering an answer: “What do you think is happening here?” “What would you want to know next?” The goal is to keep the loop of curiosity open, not to deliver information.
- **Personalized content surfacing.** The AI surfaces relevant content based on exploration history, interest signals, and engagement patterns, not just grade level and subject. The goal in every case is the right experience at the right emotional moment.
- **Lightweight adaptive personalization.** This is not skill-tree mastery tracking. It is behavioral and emotional signal-driven responsiveness: a student who has shown curiosity about space gets a different entry point than one who has shown interest in animals, even when the underlying content standard is the same.
- **Developmental register adaptation.** The AI speaks differently to a third grader than to a tenth grader. For younger students, language is warm, simple, and character-adjacent. For older students it is peer-level, intellectually curious, and substantively engaging.
- **Teacher insight synthesis.** Rather than surfacing a dashboard of raw engagement metrics, the AI synthesizes behavioral signals into plain-language insight: “Three students disengaged within the first sixty seconds of this activity, here’s what they clicked away from.” “This student returned to a video twice and submitted a reflection question, something landed.” This is actionable intelligence, not data overhead.

What the AI layer is not: It is not a replacement for adaptive mastery systems, it is complementary, adding motivational and emotional intelligence to those systems rather than competing with them. It is not a tutoring engine or academic performance system. It is not a general-purpose AI assistant that students use to complete assignments, it is a curious companion and content connector. It does not replace the teacher, it enhances teacher visibility and frees up cognitive load by surfacing meaningful signal instead of raw data.

Measuring What Actually Matters: A Student Engagement Index

For a student experience vision to be defensible, replicable across products, and genuinely useful to educators, it requires a measurement framework that goes significantly beyond completion rates and time-on-platform. The “mark as complete” paradigm tells us nothing about whether learning occurred, whether the student was curious, or whether the experience created the conditions for them to come back.

The Student Engagement Index proposed here is a composite metric designed to answer a more meaningful question: how deeply did a student interact with a learning experience? The specific shape of such an index, and the data signals that comprise it, needs to be defined in partnership with engineering, data, and research as part of an implementation process. What follows is the proposed structure.

Proposed component signals:

- **Engagement Score:** Completion %, time on page, time on activity, exploratory clicks, optional engagement, skips and drop-offs. The “streaming platform” model of quality engagement.
- **Progress Score:** Steps completed per learning object, time to completion, retries on checkpoint activities. Not academic mastery, behavioral momentum.
- **Exploration Score:** Optional content pieces accessed, time in non-required content, replays. A direct measure of curiosity.
- **Learning Expression Score:** Micro-reflection submissions, sentiment responses, “one thing I learned” entries, questions asked. Lightweight cognitive expression.
- **Social Experience Score:** Content shared, avatar or profile customization, peer interactions (where enabled).

- **Social-Emotional Engagement:** Interest selections, curiosity prompts, usage streaks, personal goal-setting behavior.

It's worth being explicit that a framework like this evolves. What can be captured from existing instrumentation is not always known up front. A dedicated working session with data and engineering to map current data availability against the proposed signals is a necessary early step in defining a realistic first version of the index, one that can be built, validated, and iterated upon.

A Workshop Methodology for Building Shared Design Pillars

Before an organization builds another student experience in isolation, there's an opportunity to pause, align, and build something every product team can benefit from. A structured, five-round workshop series is one effective way to do this: a series of working sessions intentionally scoped to remain generative and free from organizational barriers in its early stages. It is not a stakeholder presentation. It is a design thinking and strategy process.

The primary output is a set of shared design pillars for student experience: a concise, actionable framework that names the psychological principles, the K-12 engagement model, the AI integration approach, and the measurement strategy that any product team can build from. These pillars then get mapped to the specific problems each product is solving, so that every team is pulling from the same foundation while executing appropriately for its own context.

Round 1: Define, the Problem and the Pillars. Establish shared understanding of the problem, the psychological framework, and the K-12 engagement model. Output: a set of agreed design pillars that every subsequent session builds from.

Round 2: Intersect, Where Disciplines Meet. Bring in curriculum and data/analytics alongside design and product management. What does learning actually look like across the portfolio, and how do we signal it? Where does experience design end and content design begin? Output: a shared definition of what meaningful learning signal looks like across the portfolio.

Round 3: Instrument, Technical Depth and Measurement. An engineering, data, and analytics-focused session. What can actually be captured today? What requires investment? How do we build toward a real engagement index? Output: a realistic first version of the measurement framework mapped to current instrumentation.

Round 4: Apply, Product by Product. Map the framework pillars to the specific problems each product is solving. Where are the highest-leverage opportunities? Form working groups organized around product contexts to begin generating ideas. Output: defined teams with a clear brief for each.

Round 5: Connect, Come Back Together. Teams share back. Loose roadmaps and vision sketches surface. Identify connection points and shared infrastructure across products. Establish a recurring community of practice so the work doesn't dissolve after the workshop series ends. Output: a living community and shared forward momentum.

Scoping round one intentionally small, product designers and PMs who work directly on student-facing experiences, matters. Bringing senior leadership into the room before the framework exists tends to redirect generative conversation toward product-specific defensiveness. The goal of round one is a shared framework, not a shared roadmap. Leadership review and broader stakeholder sessions follow once the framework has substance.

References

Camacho-Morles, J., Slemp, G. R., Pekrun, R., Loderer, K., Hou, H., & Oades, L. G. (2021). Activity achievement emotions and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 33*(3), 1051–1095. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09585-3

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7*(2), 117–140. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202

Ghibellini, R., & Meier, B. (2025). Interruption, recall and resumption: A meta-analysis of the Zeigarnik and Ovsiankina effects. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05000-w

Glimpse K12. (2019, May 15). *Glimpse K12 analysis of school spending shows that two-thirds of software license purchases go unused* [Press release]. GlobeNewswire

Graham, A., & Anderson, K. A. (2008). "I have to be three steps ahead": Academically gifted African American male students in an urban high school on the tension between an ethnic and academic identity. *The Urban Review, 40*(5), 472–499. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-008-0088-8

Gruber, M. J., Gelman, B. D., & Ranganath, C. (2014). States of curiosity modulate hippocampus-dependent learning via the dopaminergic circuit. *Neuron, 84*(2), 486–496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.08.060

Krumboltz, J. D. (2009). The happenstance learning theory. *Journal of Career Assessment, 17*(2), 135–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072708328861

LearnPlatform by Instructure. (2025, June 30). *New LearnPlatform by Instructure report shows K-12 districts are more selective about edtech tools as they face budget crisis* [Press release]. Instructure

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*(1), 79–122. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1027

Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(1), 75–98. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.116.1.75

Nesi, J., & Prinstein, M. J. (2015). Using social media for social comparison and feedback-seeking: Gender and popularity moderate associations with depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 43*(8), 1427–1438. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-015-0020-0

Oyserman, D., Lewis, N. A., Jr., Yan, V. X., Fisher, O., O'Donnell, S. C., & Horowitz, E. (2017). An identity-based motivation framework for self-regulation. *Psychological Inquiry, 28*(2–3), 139–147. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2017.1337406

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational Psychology Review, 18*(4), 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61*, 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16*(3), 282–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(80)90056-1

Zeigarnik, B. (1927). Das Behalten erledigter und unerledigter Handlungen. *Psychologische Forschung, 9*, 1–85.

This framework reflects original strategic and research work developed while leading student experience design for a K-12 edtech platform.