Assignment 2: Content Development

We are developing learning modules in HTML and will host them on the Utah Foster Care site. Our current sprint is focused on Normalcy (learning objective 2.3 Define and Apply Normalcy Laws). In talking to our stakeholder, we can make this a stand-alone module and have decided to do that since the content is robust and only tangentially connected to travel.

- This is the Utah Foster Care page where we will link to our modules.
- Screenshot of the design of our module (intro page to Normalcy module)
- Prototype of Normalcy module – content has been redesigned after (1) user testing, (2) content development assignment, (3) stakeholder feedback.

Note: Our learning objectives have changed since we last submitted our flowchart. Objectives were re-ordered or re-worded and a couple new ones were added.

2.3 Define and Apply Normalcy Laws

Learning Objectives	Learning strategies; Rationale; Discussion
2.3.1 Provide context and purpose for normalcy law ● Compare old and new scenarios and levels of permission required ● State purpose of law is to provide most-normal childhood by lessening layers of permission	New content. Adult learning theory suggests giving students a good reason **why** they should learn. This multiple choice activity (before/after scenarios) aims to show how the law benefits both parent and child by showing that it exists to make it easier for **kids** to do activities, and easier for**parents** to give permission. This activity connects law to real life and (hopefully) engenders positive emotion to learn about the law. Update 1/31: Dr Zheng suggests video.
2.3.2 Define normalcy law. Ask learner to define normalcy. ● Provide short definition of normalcy – need of child to participate in normal activities without undue obstacles. ● State the child's right – normal childhood activity ● State the foster parent's right – give/withhold permission	Learner thinks about "normalcy" and types in free-text box their ideas. This is a cognitive learning activity where learner gets to guess; we expect most learners will be on the right track but not completely correct. Screen then displays short definition and underscores idea that "normal" depends on the kid. Screen icon helps identify it as a law. Text on screen introduces key phrase "reasonable and prudent parenting standard" which will reappear later in module.

2.3.3 Classify examples and nonexamples of normal childhood activities. ● Provide examples of activities. ● State that "normal" depends on individual child.	Show pictures of activities and have learner select which they think are "normal." Answer appears on screen underscores point that there isn't a list of normal activities – it really depends on what parent considers "normal" for the child. This activity is a rich visualization and discovery-centered activity.
2.3.4 Define reasonable and prudent parenting standard. ● Identify foster parent as decision-maker. ● Define 6 decision making criteria.	Because parental judgment is so important, there are 6 criteria to consider. We provide declarative information on screen. To limit cognitive overload, we provide: 1) acronym-- **ARBEFI**, and 2) an active learning presentation, i.e., learner clicks each acronym letter to show details about it. Learner is actively involved; they control rate at which info appears; and rate at which they consume the info. Aren't overwhelmed reading it all at once.
2.3.5 Apply criteria to a scenario and make a decision. ● Provide detailed scenario. ● Provide one or two option pairs per criterion ● Learner considers scenario details and chooses best option from each pair ● Learner makes final overall decision ● System response = no correct answer; parents must apply criteria conscientiously and make best judgment for their child.	This activity takes a constructive learning approach. Learner applies criteria presented above to a scenario. Learner reads scenario, then is presented with one or two "option-pairs" for each criterion. For example, for the Age criterion, learner chooses between "Ana is old enough to go with the neighbor family" or "Ana is too young to go because she might be supervised by an older kid." This gives them opportunity to argue with themselves and think deeply about how to apply the criteria. (It replaces dialoguing with a partner.) Learner responses appear on screen so user can review them before choosing final answer of whether they will allow child to participate in activity.
2.3.6 Clarify caseworker consultation is available ● Ask learner what they would do when unsure ● Clarify they should ask caseworker	System response to previous activity indicates no single correct answer. We anticipate most learners will think at this point, **What if I'm not sure about my decision?** So we pose this question to the learner (simple multiple choice) so they think about it before offering answer: Ask Caseworker. This is an important point so we want them to think deeply about it first before presenting the information.

2.3.7. Describe process for High-Risk Activities ● Define high-risk (more likely to cause physical injury) ● Classify examples/non-examples of high-risk ● Provide list of activites as defined in law	Definition of high-risk is presented on screen in text (more likely to cause physical injury) and some general categories of high-risk activity. Learner then does drag/matching activity – it's a constructive activity (not recall) because they must apply general knowledge to specific instances. System then provides feedback with rationale and expands on feedback with list of activities in the law.
2.3.8 Analyze high-risk scenario and if permission is required or not	Learner applies high-risk knowledge to a scenario. This scenario presents a worked example, then changes a couple details and asks the learner to identify the correct next step.