

Emergency Remote Training: Guiding and Supporting Teachers in Preparation for Emergency Remote Teaching

Peter Brereton
English for Liberal Arts
International Christian University

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to describe and evaluate the planning and delivery of training provided to help teachers prepare for emergency remote teaching. The broad aims of the training were to help teachers become accustomed to the functions of Zoom, an online video communication platform, and to consider how teaching remotely might impact their teaching practices. The first step in the training was a checklist of can-do statements which teachers could use for self-directed guidance and self-assessment. A subsequent seven-hour synchronous training day then allowed for hands-on practice of hosting Zoom lessons and provided a forum for discussions of the implications of the move to emergency remote teaching. In this paper, the effectiveness of the training is also evaluated using data from participant feedback as well as trainer reflections blended with references to the literature. Overall, despite the trainer's inexperience of online training and the lack of adequate preparation time, the training was a broad success which achieved its intended aims of preparing teachers for their initial forays into emergency remote teaching.

When it became clear in March 2020 that the emerging threat of the COVID-19 pandemic meant it would not be feasible to teach face-to-face classes in the upcoming academic year (starting in Japan in April), the most pressing issue for many educators was the need to quickly familiarize themselves with online tools and remote teaching. The purpose of this paper is firstly to describe efforts to prepare and provide initial training at short notice to teachers of English in the use of Zoom, a now ubiquitous online video communication platform. This is followed by an evaluation of the training with reference to participant feedback and trainer reflections informed by the literature.

Emergency Remote Teaching

Although the method of teaching remotely during the COVID-19 pandemic was initially described as *online teaching*, there is now recognition that *emergency remote teaching* (ERT) is more appropriate as it better reflects the urgency, the lack of adequate preparation, and the improvised rehashing of courses intended for face-to-face delivery into workable formats for the virtual classroom (Hodges, Moore, Lockee, Trust, & Bond, 2020). This is an important distinction to make as online teaching involves offering lessons specifically designed for online delivery and suggests a sense of intent and of preparedness lacking in ERT. It is fair to

assume that even among experienced online teachers, few have ever been required to completely rethink their approaches, reformulate their materials, and reimagine their approaches for an online context with only a few weeks' notice.

ERT has also redefined how technology in teaching is viewed, with much prior research irrelevant in this emergency context. For example, one commonly cited barrier to technology in teaching has been a lack of teacher willingness to adopt it in their practices (e.g. Watson, 2001), assuming a choice that ERT teachers simply do not have. Furthermore, technology has traditionally been seen as a supplementary tool for face-to-face lessons (e.g. Stanley, 2013), with models of technology use simply not accounting for it being a replacement means of lesson delivery. Puentedura's (2006) SAMR model, for instance, suggests that technology can function either as a "direct tool substitute, with no functional change" for regular activities, or as a tool for augmenting, modifying, or redefining learning tasks. However, while the intention in ERT is to use technology as a direct substitute for lesson delivery, it would be impossible to suggest there is "no functional change" between face-to-face lessons and ERT.

Context

ELA at ICU

International Christian University (ICU) in Tokyo, Japan is a liberal arts university which offers its students a bilingual education ("Japanese-English Bilingual Education", n.d.). To help students deal with the demands of academic work in both Japanese and English, the English for Liberal Arts program (ELA) is a required course of intensive study for all freshmen students who do not speak English as a first language. The main goals of the ELA are to help students develop their English proficiency and to "promote the acquisition of critical thinking and study skills" ("English for Liberal Arts Program", n.d.).

In the spring trimester of 2020, 576 students were enrolled in the ELA program, taking a range of academic reading, writing, speaking, and listening courses. 37 instructors taught on the program, and class size was between 18 and 20. This relatively small class size allows for a communicative approach and "customized instruction" with close attention paid to individual student progress, and active, student-centred, and discussion-based lessons to engage and challenge students ("English for Liberal Arts Program", n.d.). Given how fundamental active and interactive learning is to the ELA program, shifting to ERT had potentially major implications for the success of the courses.

The Need for Training

Although a number of online video communication platforms are available (including Google Meet, Skype, Microsoft Teams), Zoom is currently unique in offering a *breakout room* function, allowing hosts to create smaller discussion rooms within larger meetings. As this function facilitated student-centred discussions, it ultimately meant that Zoom appeared most suitable for replicating the active learning environment expected in face-to-face classes.

However, given Zoom's relative obscurity prior to 2020 (Iqbal, May 2020), there was likely to be a collective lack of necessary expertise amongst teachers. Due to the differences between remote and classroom teaching, it simply cannot be assumed that teachers accustomed to physical classrooms have the required skills to deal with new situations created by technology (Muñoz, Penalba, Sánchez & Santos, 2016). Indeed, use of technology as a mode of teaching has been shown to "destabilize and decenter" existing routines, practices, and "orderings" of classroom life, vastly altering learning and teaching conditions (Robertson, Shortis, Todman, John, & Dale, 2004, p. 179), suggesting that emergency remote teachers

would face a steep learning curve. As a perennial barrier to effective use of technology in education is a lack of adequate teacher training and development (Watson, 2001), there was a clear need for faculty training—and for a trainer—before the new academic year began.

As an experienced teacher trainer and a “home-grown expert” in the use of technology (Watson, 2001), I felt well-placed to lead the training. I had also had recent first-hand experience of delivering intensive remote training via Zoom. As such, I felt capable not only of helping my colleagues familiarize themselves with basic Zoom functions but of guiding them in how these could potentially be exploited in the classroom. There was no guarantee, however, that synchronous training could take place due to the limited time available and because of pre-teaching commitments such as placement testing, orientation meetings, and course planning, all of which was complicated by the shift to ERT. This was a major consideration in planning the emergency remote training.

Emergency Remote Training in the ELA

Training Aims

Using principles of backward-design Wiggins & McTighe (2006) and following the architectural adage that, in the best designs, “form follows function”, I identified the desired training outcomes as four broad aims, which were to help teachers:

1. understand how to use the functions of Zoom,
2. develop fluency/automaticity with the functions of Zoom,
3. consider how practical teaching approaches may need to be adapted for ERT,
4. consider potential issues and wider implications of ERT.

Richardson and Diaz Maggioli (2018) suggest that “The question CPD providers need to answer when designing programmes is not just what works, but what works *in this context, for these learners, teachers and leaders, at this point in time*” (p. 7). Given the circumstances, I took a two-step approach to this training. This began with an asynchronous and self-directed set of competencies to familiarise teachers with Zoom (aims 1 and 2), before holding a synchronous group training session in which teachers could get hands-on practice using Zoom and discuss the practicalities of ERT and any potential issues (aims 2-4).

Step 1: Checklist of Can-Do Statements

To work towards the first aim, I drew up a list of Zoom competencies (see Appendix) which teachers would need to be able to master in their remote lessons. These were phrased as *can-do statements*, which are a useful self-assessment tool of “provid[ing] a way for learners to assess what they can do independently. . . and what they cannot do or what they can do only with help from others” (Moeller & Yu, 2015, p. 54). This draws on Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development and distinctions drawn between those functions “that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation [and] functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryonic state” (p. 86). By raising an individual’s awareness of their own capabilities, they are thus better able to formulate “appropriate action plans to fill gap[s] in their knowledge” (Moeller & Yu, 2015, p. 54).

To support teachers in achieving the can-do statements, I created instructional *screencasts* as step-by-step guides. A screencast is essentially a video recording of a selected section of a user’s computer screen combined with an audio voiceover narration. Hyperlinks to these screencasts—each under five minutes long—were included alongside the corresponding can-do statement. The completed can-do checklist was then shared with teachers as a Google Doc, meaning it could be revised in future if required, e.g., due to new features on Zoom.

Emergency Remote Teaching

This initial asynchronous stage of the training was designed to be autonomous and time-efficient: teachers could use the checklist to help prepare them to use Zoom at their own convenience and based on their judgements of their own abilities. I also felt this approach would begin to address what was (correctly) anticipated to be a diverse range of needs, abilities, and comfort levels in the use of technology. This checklist also offered a safety net in case the synchronous training day could not be held.

Step 2: Synchronous Training Day

Although a training day of seven hours was eventually scheduled, this was with only two days' notice, meaning it was unfeasible to plan collaboratively with colleagues as I had hoped. I decided to split the training day into four main sections with the aforementioned training aims in mind, as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1.
Overview of Zoom Training Day

Stage	Training Aim	Overview	Format
1	1, 2	Introduction/Recap of can-do statements The aim of this stage was to support those who felt they may need additional support, those who had questions about the can-do competencies, and those who wanted to build their confidence.	One Zoom call. Trainer as host. Participants often working in breakout rooms of 4-6 people.
2	1, 2	Practical Zoom teaching practice sessions Each participant was given the opportunity to practice delivering a 15-minute micro-lesson to four/five other participants.	Multiple Zoom calls. Groups of five/six. Participants take turns as hosts.
LUNCH BREAK			
3	1, 2, 3	Reflection on teaching practice The aim of this stage was to provide participants with an opportunity to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reflect on the experience of hosting/participating in a Zoom lesson, • discuss any emergent questions or issues, • carry out further self-assessment of their Zoom ability. 	One Zoom call. Trainer as host.
4	3, 4	Group discussions This stage involved a variety of discussion topics which group members could choose from. These included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • security concerns • physical/mental health and wellbeing during ERT • teachers' roles during ERT • practical teaching ideas for ERT lessons • opportunities provided by ERT lessons 	Participants often working in breakout rooms of 4-6 people.

In the first, third and fourth stages, I led the training in which all teachers participated in one Zoom call, albeit with much of the discussion occurring in smaller breakout rooms of four to six participants. In this way, the training replicated how the sessions would have been run had they been face-to-face, with teachers working through tasks in small groups. This meant the training could be better contextualized and more tailored to participants' individual needs (Richardson & Diaz Maggioli, 2018) whilst also enabling communication with the trainer when required.

I approached much of the training in the same way I envisaged my ERT lessons: using Zoom as a tool for synchronous communication alongside a shared Google Doc functioning as both a handout with task information and an interactive space for participants to write questions and comments throughout the session. As well as being a visual aid to help participants follow the training, this also ensured open communication channels when participants were in different virtual spaces (i.e. in breakout rooms or in separate Zoom calls).

A further benefit was that teachers could experience how a communicative lesson with multiple participants could be achieved with Zoom. This Loop Input method—whereby the process and the content of learning are aligned to create a more immersive learning experience (Woodward, 1986)—was also chosen to provide participants with insights into how students might perceive Zoom lessons, both in the experience of receiving instruction online, and in understanding which Zoom tools are available to students mid-lesson.

Given that teachers would host Zoom lessons on a daily basis, it was essential that participants had the opportunity to practice setting up and initiating a Zoom call as well as managing a group of people within the call itself. The second stage of the training was therefore dedicated to hands-on practice of hosting a Zoom call. This was complex to plan as it is not possible to be in two Zoom calls simultaneously, meaning all participants would be required to leave the original call in order to host their own. During this time, I anticipated it would be difficult for me as trainer to effectively monitor or provide support where needed. To mitigate this, I designated a section of the collaborative Google Doc for participants to write their questions and issues during practice, which I responded to in writing.

To create a more authentic context at this stage, I requested that all participants prepare a short text or video they could use as a basis for discussion in a 15-minute “micro-lesson” they would “teach” to fellow participants. Groups of five was optimal as this enabled each teacher to host four other participants, allowing them authentic practice of Zoom tools, such as dividing participants into breakout rooms. However, it was impossible to anticipate how many teachers would attend and it was unlikely that the number of participants would allow for groups of exactly five. If larger groups were required, I was conscious that participants may perceive they were spending too long acting as students rather than getting hands-on practice of hosting themselves. I was also mindful that larger groups would require more time and finish later than others. As such, I scheduled this practical session before the lunch break, and requested that everyone reconvene at the same time after lunch in the original Zoom call to continue with the afternoon's training.

Training Evaluation

To diagnose its relative success and increase accountability, evaluation of any *continuous professional development* (CPD) is necessary (Richardson & Diaz Maggioli, 2018). This is often thought of as costly and time-consuming, though Guskey (2000) stresses that good evaluation is “simply the refinement of everyday thinking” (p. 41). With this in mind, in the

section that follows this Zoom training is evaluated with post-training survey responses from 21 participants along with my own reflections of the experience blended with reference to the literature.

Participant Feedback

A post-training questionnaire was distributed with the aim of gathering feedback and gauging ongoing needs of ELA instructors. Although this included some multiple-choice items, most questions were open-ended as they can provide “a far greater “richness” than fully quantitative data” (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 47) and “lead to a greater level of discovery” (Gilham, 2000, p. 5).

Of the 21 total respondents, most ($n=19$) were “very satisfied” with the training day with two others “moderately satisfied.” The most useful aspect of the training was overwhelmingly the opportunity to practice teaching ($n=19$). This was seen as an opportunity to “determine which features worked/didn’t work, which would be useful, etc.,” to “see what technical aspects of Zoom lessons I need to improve,” and to “see things from a student’s perspective.” The opportunity to communicate with colleagues was also beneficial for many ($n=7$), such as discussing teaching ideas, getting feedback on micro-lessons, and “spotting problems that I would not have noticed myself.” When asked what would have made the training more effective, six respondents said they would like more time; four others suggested that more breaks or spreading the training over a longer period of time would have been preferable. One respondent commented that “it was exhausting, although it was incredibly useful for gaining a student’s perspective.” One respondent suggested that a “flipped” approach, with teachers preparing more prior to the sessions, would have been more time-efficient.

Between 85% and 95% of respondents stated they were “very confident” in using the Zoom functions (setting up calls, inviting students to a call, using breakout rooms, using the shared screen function, and managing the participants in a Zoom call). However, this contrasted starkly with their perceived preparedness to manage technology issues: 57% said they were not at all confident ($n=4$) or slightly confident ($n=8$) in anticipating potential problems, while 71% said they were not at all confident ($n=10$) or slightly confident ($n=5$) in troubleshooting any unexpected issues. This indicates that although teachers felt able to handle day-to-day Zoom lessons, they required further training to improve their “contextual problem-solving skillsets,” as recommended by Muñoz, Penalba, Sánchez and Santos (2016). Indeed, a clear expectation that further training would take place was evident, as seven respondents alluded (unprompted) to subsequent sessions (e.g. “shorter sessions would definitely be more manageable next time”) in their comments.

When asked about their feelings towards the upcoming term, ten respondents used negative terms such as “anxious” ($n=5$), “worried” ($n=2$), “nervous” ($n=1$), “overwhelmed” ($n=1$), “under pressure” ($n=1$). In contrast, five respondents described themselves as “excited” by the opportunity to learn from ERT; as one respondent put it, “we will learn HEAPS about ourselves and our pedagogy.” A further five respondents used a combination of positive and negative feelings, such as “excited but anxious,” and “nervous but motivated.”

The biggest anticipated challenges of the upcoming term can be grouped into two main areas. The first concerned pedagogical aspects: adjusting teaching practices ($n=5$), customising teaching materials/course content ($n=2$), “getting through” all course objectives ($n=2$), and meeting students’ expectations ($n=1$). Aspects of pastoral care were also predicted to be challenging, including fostering a sense of community ($n=3$), engaging/motivating students ($n=3$), and supporting students with “lower English abilities” ($n=2$). The second group of challenges concerned potential technology issues, most pressingly in terms of

teachers' ability to solve problems as they arise (for themselves or their students) ($n=6$) but also regarding hardware concerns (e.g. reliable internet) ($n=4$) and student preparedness ($n=3$).

Finally, respondents were asked what kind of ongoing training they felt would be most beneficial for them during the semester. Suggestions were for sharing practical teaching ideas ($n=8$), troubleshooting tips for technology ($n=5$), getting advice on other online tools for ERT ($n=4$), and generally "find[ing] out how we are all getting on" ($n=1$). Four others stated they were unsure of their current needs and needed more time to "fully realise [their] limitations."

Trainer Reflections

The following analysis is based on my own reflections on the training, which I carried out primarily in the days following the training. At this point, I was able to analyse my approaches more systematically, which had not been possible during preparation. As such, references to the literature are "blended into" my reflections to present a post-training context of analysis (Sawyer & Norris, 2013, p. 20).

Checklist of can-do statements. For CPD in the use of technology, it is important that the participants' current competence levels are determined so that level-appropriate training can be delivered (Carlson & Gadio, 2002). While it was unfeasible for me to carry out a needs analysis prior to the training, I felt the can-do checklist was an effective tool for ensuring a minimum ability before the training day, which made it easier to gauge the level at which to pitch the synchronous training.

For teachers, the checklist provided a clear framework for them to assess their own ability and their progression (Hartley, Kinshuk, Koper, Okamoto, & Spector, 2010). This was well-received by colleagues, several of whom asked permission to share the checklist with teachers at other institutions. I therefore created a public version of the checklist, which has since been viewed and shared by over 600 individuals worldwide including Canada, Spain, India, Italy, and Australia. This would suggest a widespread need for support in the use of Zoom and perhaps point to a general lack of institutional support in the use of technology for teachers.

One major concern of teachers working with technology is computer anxiety, a feeling of "uneasiness, apprehension, and anxiousness" which can manifest itself as reluctance, frustration, or increased negativity (Chang, 2005, p. 715). Computer anxiety stems partly from the embarrassment caused by a lack of necessary skillset but primarily from the challenge of actually carrying out tasks using computers (Russell & Bradley, 1997). As such, I felt the inclusion of screencasts was particularly valuable, augmenting the checklist from a simple self-assessment tool to an interactive training document which could guide teachers of all competencies. While the screencasts could clearly not eradicate computer anxiety, they did serve as effective in countering it, allowing teachers to practice at their own pace and providing a permanent source of support in case of any doubts once teaching began.

Synchronous training day. Effective CPD should be grounded in specific classroom practices (Farrell, 2012; Walter & Briggs, 2012) and focus on "learning through doing, tackling real issues, [and] developing practical solutions" (Richardson & Diaz Maggioli, p. 8). As such, the requirement that participants teach micro-lessons to colleagues was a vital component and provided practical first-hand experience of what it might be like to manage a small group of learners. While a micro-lesson is obviously no substitute for authentic teaching experiences, it did offer participants a low-stakes, non-judgmental environment to put their new skills into practice (Birman, Desimone, Porter, & Garet, 2000; Hayes, 1995). This hands-on practice

Emergency Remote Teaching

enabled participants to better consider how their teaching might differ in a remote context and allowed for insightful feedback from peers, who are a powerful learning tool (Richardson & Diaz Maggioli, 2018). Most importantly, this approach helped boost participants' confidence in their ability to use the technology. Levels of confidence are vital for success in online teaching; research has even suggested that confidence and a sense of self-efficacy in this respect are more influential than actual technological knowledge (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

As a trainer, managing the synchronous training was quite a change from face-to-face experiences, and it felt fairly chaotic at times. This perceived chaos was likely caused by two factors which are unique to remote training. Firstly, it was challenging to manage approximately 30 participants, particularly as some had to intermittently leave and rejoin the training due to other commitments. Secondly, the nature of remote training also made it less easy to monitor all groups simultaneously, ensure all groups were on task, and offer my own support when required, as is the case in face-to-face contexts. Hattie (2012) suggests that an effective educator continually innovates as a lesson progresses, using their adaptive expertise to “react to where the students are as they progress from what they know (their prior learning) towards their desired learning (successfully achieving the intended learning of the lesson)” (p. 107). In this remote training, I felt a distinct lack of meaningful interaction with participants and, as such, found it difficult to manage the training as I might ordinarily expect to, such as gauging participants' progress, expanding upon their questions or ideas for the benefit of the whole group, and generally adapting the training in response to developing and emerging needs.

The difficulty in monitoring and assessing progress also made time management difficult. While I had fully anticipated timing would be an issue in the micro-lesson section, it became evident that the amount of time spent on the afternoon discussions varied greatly. In face-to-face training, this would have been more easily observable (and more manageable) and although I had hoped to dedicate more time to discussing the practical implications of ERT, I made the conscious decision to prioritize participants' preferences over my desire to cover all of the planned content. Training, particularly in the use of technology, cannot be rushed; teachers require time to familiarize themselves with the tools in question (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010) and to ensure they feel comfortable and confident using them in their teaching (Carlson & Gadio, 2002). Overall, there was simply too much content and not enough time to cover it.

To be effective, CPD ought to take place over a prolonged period of time. A sustained approach to CPD enables content to be “chunked” to avoid overwhelming teachers (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989) while also allowing teachers to try out new practices in their own classroom (Farrell, 2012). In contrast, one-off training sessions are usually ineffective at creating deep and lasting change (Richardson & Diaz-Maggioli, 2018), particularly in the use of technology (Carlson & Gadio, 2002). Ideally, I would have split the training day over several days to take a more “chunked” approach, yet the defining characteristic of emergency remote teaching is that it involves hurried preparation and, at times, less than ideal compromises. This meant there was simply no time available to offer an extended, extensive pre-term training program.

Finally, if adequate time for systematic planning had been available, I would have greatly valued the support of colleagues in all aspects of the training. This training was created entirely unilaterally by me, but I was by no means the only person capable of devising and leading the training. Collaboration with others would certainly have enriched the quality of training, while a coordinated approach would also have provided better individual support to

smaller groups of teachers, rather than a “one-size fits all” approach which is occasionally necessary with one lead trainer. For further individual support, it would have been beneficial to have pre-assigned groups based on participant ability, if there had been time to assess participants and plan the logistics. This would have enabled improved peer support, and ensured groups were more equally balanced in terms of competence.

Ongoing needs. Despite the relative success of this initial training program, there is clearly a need for further and ongoing CPD to help teachers adjust to their new remote context. While there may still be some anxiety regarding the use of technology as a means of lesson delivery, I believe that this will decrease as teachers gain experiential knowledge of ERT. In contrast, there will be a growing need for teachers to consider and adapt their teaching approaches in response to the differences and limitations inherent in the online context. To this end, *practitioner research* would prove effective at helping teachers examine their own practices, find solutions for problems they encounter, and ultimately develop a deeper understanding of their practices and their context (Borg, 2010; Burns, 2009).

There is also an urgent need for teachers to be aware of the potential risks to their mental health and emotional wellbeing during ERT. Teachers are constantly expected to display “appropriate” emotions and engage in *emotion labour*—“the work of managing emotions in order to meet social and institutional expectations” (Song, 2018, p. 455). This can be exhausting, particularly when teachers are under stress. However, it is important not to underestimate the potential impact of the ongoing global situation. As Rice & Groves (2005) define trauma as “an exceptional experience in which powerful and dangerous events overwhelm a person’s capacity to cope” (p. 3), it is no understatement to describe the COVID-19 pandemic as a traumatic experience which could deeply affect any individual’s ability to function. It would therefore be unsurprising if this led to an exacerbation of teachers’ emotion labour, and potentially to mental exhaustion, burnout, and depression (Jeung, Kim, & Chang, 2018; King, 2016).

It is also important to remember that remote teachers do not benefit as much from the incidental yet invaluable peer support usually associated with working on the same program. Isolated from the everyday conversations with colleagues, teaching could become a very solitary endeavour. However, as teachers in unfamiliar contexts face greater stress and frustration (Apelman, 1978), the need for frequent collegial communication has arguably never been greater. As such, actively working to establish an online community of practice would be an effective way of increasing collegial support, as it provides teachers with regular opportunities to learn collaboratively, build a common understanding of instructional approaches, and reflect on practice in conjunction with their colleagues (Riel & Polin, 2004).

Conclusion

Although I am an experienced teacher trainer, the combination of limited planning time, my relative unfamiliarity with Zoom, and my inexperience of delivering training remotely challenged me in more ways than I have ever previously experienced. Yet, despite these extenuating circumstances, I felt that the training was generally a success in that the content I covered and the approach I took meant that the four training aims were achieved. In addition, the positive participant feedback is a strong indicator that my colleagues appreciated the training and felt it was beneficial in their preparations for ERT. However, as the literature and my reflections suggest, emergency remote teachers have more profound needs than simply being familiar with the mode of teaching. Indeed, despite my own satisfaction and the clear

appreciation from my colleagues, I reflected later, “I wonder how much difference *this* training made, and how much it was simply a case of teachers appreciating the opportunity to share their concerns with colleagues and the sense of comfort that comes with knowing that they were not alone.”

However, as I return to this paper again eight months later, this post-training comment seems a little overcritical of my own efforts given the circumstances at the time. The training may not have transformed these teachers into expert remote teachers overnight. But nor was that the aim. With a traumatic pandemic as the backdrop to inadequately prepared teachers in a strange new context attempting to master unfamiliar technology, the priority was for teachers to feel supported as part of a caring and helpful team of colleagues in the same situation, and to understand that others were experiencing the same nerves as they rushed to master new skills in the days before term began. I can therefore say I am proud of my achievements and I am satisfied that this *emergency remote training* did a great deal in reassuring my ELA colleagues, in reducing their anxiety and boosting their confidence and, perhaps most importantly, in bringing us all together before we tackled the challenges of emergency remote teaching.

References

- Birman, B., Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership* 57(8), 28-33.
http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el200005_birman.pdf
- Borg, S. (2010). Language teacher research engagement. *Language Teaching*, 43(4), 391-429.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000170>
- Burns, A. (2009). Action research in second language teacher education. In A. Burns, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 289-297). Cambridge University Press.
- Carlson, S., & Gadio, C.T. (2002). Teacher professional development in the use of technology. In W.D. Haddad & A. Draxler (Eds.), *Technologies for Education: Potentials, Parameters, and Prospects*. UNESCO and the Academy for Educational Development.
http://woulibrary.wou.edu.my/weko/eed502/Chapter_8.pdf
- Chang, S.E. (2005). Computer anxiety and perception of task complexity in learning programming-related skills. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 21, 713–728.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2004.02.021>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- “English for Liberal Arts Program”. (n.d.)
<https://www.icu.ac.jp/en/academics/undergraduate/ela/>
- Farrell, T.S.C. (2012). Novice-service language teacher development: Bridging the gap between pre-service and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 435-449. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.36>
- Gilham, B. (2000) *Developing a questionnaire*. Continuum International Publishing.
- Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Corwin Press.
- Hattie, J.A.C. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Hartley, R., Kinshuk, Koper, R., Okamoto, T., & Spector, J. M. (2010). The education and training of learning technologists: A competences approach. *Educational Technology & Society*, 13(2), 206–216.

- <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.176.8029&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Hayes, D. (1995). In-service teacher development: Some basic principles, *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 252-261. <https://doi.org/1093/elt/49.3.252>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*, 27. <https://medicine.hofstra.edu/pdf/faculty/facdev/facdev-article.pdf>
- Iqbal, M. (2020, May 13). *Zoom revenue and usage statistics (2020)*. Business of apps. <https://www.businessofapps.com/data/zoom-statistics/>
- “Japanese-English Bilingual Education”. (n.d.) <https://www.icu.ac.jp/en/academics/bilingual/>
- Jeung, D. Y., Kim, C., & Chang, S. J. (2018). Emotional labor and burnout: A review of the literature. *Yonsei Medical Journal*, 59(2), 187–193. <https://doi.org/10.3349/ymj.2018.59.2.187>
- King, J. (2016). ‘It’s time, put on the smile, it’s time!’: The emotional labour of second language teaching within a Japanese university. In C. Gkonou, D. Tatzl & S. Mercer (Eds.) *New directions in language learning psychology* (pp. 97-112). Springer.
- Moeller, A., & Yu, F. (2015). NCSSFL-ACTFL can-do statements: An effective tool for improving language learning within and outside the classroom. In P. Swanson (Ed.), *Dimension 2015* (pp. 50-69). SCOLT.
- Puenteadura, R. R. (2006). *Building upon SAMR*. <http://hippamus.com/rpweblog/archives/2012/09/03/BuildingUponSAMR.pdf>
- Rice, K.F. & Groves, B. M. (2005). *Hope and healing: A caregiver's guide to helping young children affected by trauma*. Zero to Three Press.
- Richardson, S. & Diaz Maggioli, G. (2018). *Effective professional development: Principles and best practice*, Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Whitepaper_TD_72dpi-final-online-version.pdf
- Riel, M., & Polin, L (2004). Learning communities: Common ground and critical differences in designing technical support. In S. Barab, R. Kling, & J. Gray (Eds.). *Designing for virtual communities in the service of learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, S., Shortis, T., Todman, N., John, P., & Dale, R. (2004). ICT in the classroom: The pedagogical challenge of respatialisation and reregulation. In M. Olssen (Ed.), *Culture and learning: Access and opportunity in the curriculum*. Greenwood Press.
- Sawyer, R.D. & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, G. (2013). *Language learning with technology: Ideas for integrating technology in the classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development. *Journal of Staff Development*, 10(4), 40-57. <http://beersheva.pisga.edu.gov.il/exl-teacher/DocLib19/Five%20Models%20of%20Staff%20Development.doc>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Walter, C., & Briggs, J. (2012). *What professional development makes the most difference to teachers? A report sponsored by Oxford University Press*. Oxford University Press. http://www.education.ox.ac.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/07/WalterBriggs_2012_TeacherDevelopment_public_v2

Emergency Remote Teaching

- Watson, G. (2001) Models of information technology teacher professional development that engage with teachers' hearts and minds. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 10(1-2), 179-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14759390100200110>
- Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2006). *Understanding by design: A framework for effecting curriculum development and assessment*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Woodward, T. (1986). Loop-input: A new strategy for trainers. *System*, 16(1), 23–28. doi:10.1016/0346-251x(88)90006-1.

Emergency Remote Teaching

Appendix

Teacher Zoom Can-Do Checklist

	I can...	Need some help?
Initial set-up	create an account with zoom.us using my ICU email address	Watch this video
	download and install the Zoom "Client for Meeting" program on my computer	Download from here
	make sure the language settings for the interface are in the language I want (<i>optional</i>)	Link
	schedule a meeting and share the information with participants.	Watch this video Updated videos: - Scheduling recurring meetings - Adding meetings to Google calendar
	set up Breakout Rooms for your lessons	Watch this video
	New: pre-assign Breakout Rooms using a .csv file	Watch this video Use this .csv template
	New: prepare and use Polling	Watch this video (More information)
	begin hosting a meeting	Link
During the call	test my hardware: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure my microphone is working - ensure my video is working - mute/unmute my own microphone 	Watch this video (More information: Audio / Video)
	send invitations to participants during a meeting (<i>only necessary if students don't already have the link</i>)	Watch this video (More information)
	manage participants in the meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mute/unmute participants' microphones - toggle participants' videos - different layout options for viewing participants 	Watch this video
	share my screen with participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - whiteboard function - share screen view 	Watch this video (More information)
	use the chat function: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - send chat messages to individuals/the group - share files with participants 	Watch this video (More information)
	use reactions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clapping, thumbs up - raise a hand, go slower, need a break, etc. 	Watch this video
	use Breakout Rooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - start/end breakout rooms - move between breakout rooms 	Watch this video (More information)
	end a meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - leave call - end meeting for everyone - view saved chat and video recordings 	Watch this video
	New check meeting usage reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - see who attended your meeting and for how long 	Watch this video (More information)