

Guidelines for Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education: The CARE Framework

Kamla Sulaiman Al Amri

Thesis/Dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech)
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In

Curriculum and Instruction

Glen A. Holmes (Chair)

Alicia L. Johnson

Barbara B. Lockee

Aaron M. Bond

February 7, 2025

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Care, Pedagogy, Faculty Development, Guidelines

Guidelines for Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education: The CARE Framework

Kamla Sulaiman Al Amri

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic drew considerable attention to online teaching at higher education institutions around the globe. This left some institutions unprepared for the sudden shift, and dealing with many challenges including, but not limited to faculty development. This study employs a design and development research (DDR) methodology to identify and create guidelines and considerations for integrating care pedagogy into faculty development programs at higher education institutions during emergency remote teaching (ERT). These care-focused faculty development guidelines are designed and developed using Type 2 model research and operationalizing the ADDIE Model. The guidelines were structured into a framework called CARE: Care adoption in remote environments. A panel of eight expert reviewers was recruited to validate and lead the evaluation process after the formation of these guidelines. The hope is that these care-informed faculty development guidelines may offer clarity and guidance to faculty at tertiary education institutions. This will allow them to implement effective care-full pedagogy within emergency remote teaching settings, and help students to optimize their online learning experiences.

Guidelines for Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education: The CARE Framework

Kamla Sulaiman Al Amri

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic caused widespread disruptions around the world. Many higher education institutions struggled because of this sudden shift to online teaching. Hence, many students felt anxious, stressed, and overwhelmed. As the pandemic brought some challenges, it also opened new opportunities for faculty development. This design and development research study employs Type 2 model research to create a set of guidelines associated with some targeted strategies to function as framework to guide faculty in higher education settings to integrate a caring pedagogy into their teaching practices to help students mitigate learning challenges during time of crises and maximize their ERT learning experiences. The guidelines were organized within a framework known as CARE: Care adoption in remote environments. A panel of eight expert reviewers was recruited to evaluate and critique these guidelines. Based on their suggestions and recommendations, certain revisions are required to enhance the design of these guidelines in future versions.

DEDICATION

To my parents: My beloved mother and the soul of my father.

To my wonderful family, and especially to my supportive husband, Ali, whose unwavering support relentlessly pushed me forward.

To my great sons—Alfadhli, Saif, and Omar—who have been by my side throughout this academic and adventurous journey of pursuing my Ph.D.

To my dear sisters, whose prayers have never ceased and have reached me across borders.

To my beloved country, Oman, where I truly belong.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank Almighty Allah for granting me health, might, and courage to accomplish my objective and finalize this dissertation. I would also like to express my gratitude to myself, Kamla, for achieving my goal and successfully completing my Ph.D. There are also many other remarkable individuals without whom I could not have completed this dissertation. Dr. Glen Holmes, my Chair, I owe you heartfelt thanks and sincere gratitude for your insights, wisdom, support, and guidance. I would also like to extend my special thanks to my research committee members. Dr. Alicia Johnson, for your constant support, optimism, and care. To you, Dr. Barbara Lockee, I say thank you for your help, encouragement, and feedback. Dr. Aaron Bond, thank you for your kindness and support. Further, to the expert reviewers, I am deeply appreciative of your expertise, insights, and constructive critiques. The time you dedicated to reviewing my work played a significant role in shaping my research.

In addition, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the two Senior Newman Librarians: Cozette Comer, the Evidence Synthesis Services Coordinator at the University Libraries at Virginia Tech and Lisa Becksford Russell, Head of Learning Design Initiatives at the University Libraries at Virginia Tech for their library consultations, support, and professionalism. To you both, I say deep thank you.

To my wonderful family, I express heartfelt gratitude for your encouragement, understanding, and support throughout the process of completing this dissertation. Your love and confidence in me have been a continuous source of strength and motivation. Besides, I say thank you to my peers, fellow graduate students who helped me pilot the survey of my study.

To conclude, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the government of the Sultanate of Oman (Sultan Qaboos University & Ministry of Higher Education, Research & Innovation) for their generous funding and support throughout my Ph.D. journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Guidelines for Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education: The CARE Framework.....	i
ABSTRACT	ii
GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Emergency Remote Teaching Challenges.....	1
Problem Statement	5
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Rationale for the Study	6
Research Question	8
Summary	8
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Introduction	9
Defining Care Pedagogy	9
Caring Behaviors in Traditional Higher Education Contexts	11
“Caring” in Online Education and Emergency Remote Teaching	13
Emergency Remote Teaching vs. Planned Remote Teaching	17
Faculty Development for Online Education	18
Faculty Development During and Post COVID-19	22
Care in Relation to Cultural Competencies and Faculty Development	26
Faculty Development and Institutional Support	28
Theoretical Frameworks and Models.....	29
Noddings’ Caring Ethic and Moral Education.....	30
Noddings’ Caring Ethics in Educational Technology, Online Teaching, and Emergency Remote Teaching	31
Summary	32
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY.....	33
Introduction	33
Research Design	33
Research Procedures.....	35
<i>Phase One - Analysis.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Phase Two - Design</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Phase Three - Development (Operationalization of Theoretical Underpinnings)</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Phase Four – Implementation & Evaluation</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Phase Five – Revision</i>	<i>41</i>

Characteristics of the Population	41
Research Tool - Expert Review Questionnaire	42
Establishing Validity - Unique Research Design Concerns.....	42
Summary	43
CHAPTER 4 DEVELOPING GUIDELINES & STRATEGIES FOR INTEGRATING CARE INTO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT.....	44
Introduction	44
Guidelines Development Process.....	44
<i>Phase One - Review and Analysis of the Literature.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Phase Two – Creation of the Guidelines and Their Strategies</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Phase Three - Preparing Survey Questions for the Expert Reviewers</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Phase Four – Organizing Resources for the Expert Reviewers.....</i>	<i>56</i>
Summary	57
CHAPTER 5 EVALUATION AND REVISION.....	58
Introduction	58
Research Overview.....	58
QuestionPro Survey and Respondents.....	59
Expert Reviewer Profiles	60
Expert Reviewers’ Evaluation	62
Reviewers’ Feedback on Modeling	62
Summary	102
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	104
Introduction	104
Research Overview and Summary	104
Theoretical and Practical Contributions of the Study	105
Study Limitations.....	107
Recommendations for Future Research Directions	108
Conclusions	108
REFERENCES.....	110
APPENDICES.....	127
Appendix A: Research Strategy & Selection From the Literature	128
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter	133
Appendix C: Informed Consent Document	134
Appendix D: Expert Reviewer Recruitment Invitation Letter	138
Appendix E: Email Reminder.....	139
Appendix F: Expert Reviewer Questionnaire	140
Appendix G: Expert Reviewers Responses Data Sets	145

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Types of Development Research in Design and Development Research (DDR)	35
Table 2	Specified Methodology Design Considerations	37
Table 3	Emergent Care-Related Themes and Occurrences Within Noddings' Care Model	47
Table 4	Themes, Strategies, and associated guidelines	48

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines the background information for the study and begins with providing a brief description of emergency remote teaching challenges. In addition, this chapter defines the problem statement that this study will seek to investigate and solve. The purpose of the study, and the study rationale will be discussed. Ultimately, the chapter closes with the main research question guiding this study.

Emergency Remote Teaching Challenges

Emergency remote teaching (ERT) circumstances drew considerable attention during, and immediately after, the COVID-19 pandemic. During the COVID-19 pandemic, higher education institutions were “forced” to implement widespread and large-scale arrangements for online education (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020). This emergency alternative was needed to ensure the continuity of higher education throughout the periods of home quarantine (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Al Harthy & Al Ani, 2023; Al-Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020).

During and after COVID-19, there has been an abundance of literature published discussing the effects and challenges of the pandemic. These mainly focused on the challenges and limitations of ERT, as well as other areas related to faculty perceptions and challenges during the ERT experience. Again, the pandemic has underscored the significance of online teaching at higher education institutions to guarantee continuity of education during emergency situations (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Al Harthy & Al Ani, 2023; Al-Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020). While innovative technology can be beneficial, it can also place students and faculty in unfamiliar territory until they become familiar with it.

For instance, Al-Naabi and Al Abri (2021) devised (a three-part) cross-sectional survey design to

investigate faculty experiences with the implementation of e-learning for ERT caused by the pandemic at higher education institutions. The questionnaire was administered to 856 faculty at both public and private higher education institutions. They investigated four barrier groups relating to instructors, the institution, curriculum, and students. The study assessed the connection between these barrier levels, and measured the differences related to e-learning and other variables such as instructor gender, academic qualifications, teaching experience, and previous knowledge in e-learning. Their findings indicated that student-related challenges had the most powerful influence on the implementation of e-learning during ERT. Faculty educational qualifications and prior experience were also found to impact the success of e-learning conventions. Based on these findings, a national policy was recommended for the delivery of online education, as well as a national policy for approaching any unexpected ERT situation. The researchers also proposed further study and research in the areas of faculty training and professional development for ERT settings. Overall, they concluded that, “higher education providers need to implement professional development provisions and adjust their teaching and learning policies to suit the ERT context” (A- Naabi & Al Abri, 2021, p.191).

In another study, Abdulsattar et al., (2021) evaluated the quality of e-learning platforms such as Microsoft Teams, Google Meet, and Zoom during the pandemic based on international standards. Their findings suggested that the programs were of high quality from the perspectives of teaching faculty and students. However, using these e-learning platforms posed equal challenges to students and faculty members. Those specific hurdles included weak internet connection, poor technical support, poor time-management, lack of mechanisms to collect enrollment information, an absence of tools to verify cheating occurrences and address exam integrity, and technical incompetence with the e-learning tools.

Magd and Jonathan (2023) offered compelling evidence suggesting that some higher education institutions lack guidance, support, and knowledge of best practices for the implementation and delivery of online teaching programs. This conclusion was reached after conducting a survey with twenty-five

higher education institutions (private and public). Their study provided evidence that verified some of the challenges faced by teaching faculty at these institutions, such as a high rate of student absenteeism, lack of standardized methods for online assessment, inadequate understanding of assessment tools, insufficient institutional support and guidance, limited access to technology, and ineffective approaches to handling academic integrity violations.

Other obstacles mentioned in the literature, based on interviews with teaching faculty and administrators at two different higher education institutions, include the need for technical and pedagogical training, the necessity of faculty involvement in decision-making or planning for professional development activities related to online teaching, a lack of interaction on online platforms, lack of awareness about using technology tools for various instructional purposes, the absence of building a learning community, and a lack of familiarity with course design (Yapar & Dayananda, 2022).

An eight-week online teaching experiment, accompanied by the distribution of online surveys and online interviews, was conducted by Slimi (2020). This study gathered information from faculty and students about their online teaching and learning experiences during COVID-19. The findings indicated that they enjoyed the experience of online learning. However, they encountered some challenges such as weak internet connection, a lack of student cooperation and autonomy, certain cultural issues, inadequate technological infrastructure, and a lack of preparedness among faculty and students to use technology tools in the online environment.

In a similar vein, the literature confirmed and emphasized challenges encountered by faculty regarding online assessments during ERT. During the global and rapid pivot to emergency remote teaching, faculty were put in a situation where they had to design online assessments (Rahim, 2020) to ensure the continuity of their learners' education. It has been noted and observed that many faculty lacked sound assessment practices, which impacted the overall quality of ERT (Rahim, 2020). Similarly, faculty at higher education institutions in Oman grappled with the design of effective and reliable online

assessment tools to assess student learning outcomes during emergency remote teaching. This condition created ethical challenges for students, negatively impacting the academic integrity associated with assessment and the overall quality of ERT education (Al-Maqbali & Hussain, 2020; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020).

A mixed-methods study conducted by Al-Maqbali and Hussain (2020) on faculty in the School of Education at a large public university found that faculty faced a variety of limitations when managing online assessments. Some of these included students declining to turn on their cameras, heavy teacher load (leading to the inability of faculty to create online assessment materials), cheating, lengthy time needed to develop online assessment tools, impersonation/dishonesty, difficulty assessing some learning outcomes online, academic integrity violation, grade inflation, assessing group work, and large class sizes. Among their recommendations, the researchers called upon educational management and faculty development providers to investigate and address the need for a tailored ERT professional development program for faculty. Providing these professional development sessions for faculty exhibited a sense of caring for students' academic achievement, faculty performance, and the overall quality of the ERT experience.

In the post COVID-19 era, the literature has still been concerned with faculty perceptions about online education. To state an example, Yapar and Dayananda (2022) conducted a qualitative study to investigate the perceptions of teaching faculty and administrators towards online education. Their findings showed that participants indicated more negative attitudes towards online education than positive. However, they still believed that there were some benefits related to online education. Among the advantages they mentioned were accessibility, the opportunity to learn new skills (for both teachers and students), safety, independent (autonomous) learning, financial and pedagogical benefits, availability of resources, and reduced stress. Their study concluded that, "participants expressed a need for effective online pedagogical training" (Yapar & Dayananda, 2022, p. 411).

In essence, the lack of proper faculty development during ERT seemed to be a recurring theme regarding the challenges expressed in relation to online instruction. Faculty development, training, and preparedness within the ERT context appeared to be insufficient and inadequate at some higher education institutions (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Magd & Jonathan 2023; Slimi, 2020; Yapar & Dayananda, 2022). While studies have called for faculty development and training for online instruction including ERT, there is a scarcity of research and a lack of focus on the development of faculty knowledge and skills to effectively integrate a care-informed pedagogy into emergency remote teaching contexts.

Problem Statement

As stated earlier, the pandemic posed many challenges to educational institutions worldwide. Several studies have cited the challenges and lack of faculty development for ERT (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Magd & Jonathan 2023; Slimi, 2020; Yapar & Dayananda, 2022). While there has been great attention directed towards addressing the immediate challenges posed by the pandemic, there has been a notable absence of focus towards the development and training of faculty to integrate a care-full pedagogy to care for students' well-being and meet their psychological and emotional needs. Fundamentally, "focusing on how to overcome the [ERT] complications resulted in overlooking affective learning variables" (Al Sulaimi, 2022, p.5) and learners' emotional well-being. Hence, the theme of caring is an under researched area, and has not been properly examined in the context of online instruction at higher education institutions and within the ERT landscape (Burke & Larmar, 2020; Rabin, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020). There are currently calls for further care-focused investigations in higher education settings (Kızılcık & Türüdü, 2022; Strachan, 2020). Even though implementing compassionate and caring pedagogy with students can be more challenging when physical and social distances exist (Gelles et al., 2020), there is hope that individuals can learn to care and be cared for (Noddings, 2012, p.78). Although the knowledge and skills of caring have been viewed as "tacit and implicit in action" (Robinson et al., 2020, p.101; Rogers & Webb, 1991), faculty should be professionally trained to acquire

this knowledge and apply it within online education contexts, including ERT (Burke & Larmar, 2020).

Purpose of the Study

Motivated by the worldwide upheaval generated by the pandemic, this design and development research study endeavored to design a faculty development and training agenda tailored for faculty within any future ERT context. It proposed strategies, considerations, and guidelines to prepare faculty to integrate care pedagogy into their online instruction and delivery, and to optimize their experience when faced with future ERT situations. As previously mentioned, COVID-19 was the driving force behind this faculty development plan. This study is an early attempt to investigate faculty development post-COVID-19. The researcher was prompted to conduct this study due to one major reason. Namely, the researcher believed that ERT provided a unique experience for faculty to deal with online teaching environments. This is especially true since systematic digital online delivery was lacking in some areas around the world prior to COVID-19 (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Al Harthy & Al Ani, 2023; Al- Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020).

In closing, the current study sought to address and investigate the integration of care- informed pedagogy into faculty development for ERT settings. In today's post-pandemic world, higher education instructors need effective and care-full faculty development frameworks. These frameworks will hopefully guide faculty to boost their students' motivation, engagement, retention, and optimize their achievement of learning outcomes.

Rationale for the Study

The rapid pivot to emergency remote teaching in response to the COVID- 19 pandemic posed substantial challenges to higher education institutions nationwide. As a result of this, faculty members and instructors were assigned the task of adapting their teaching methods to online delivery and remote online environments; this was often done with time constraints and little to no training (Al-Naabi & Al

Abri 2021; Covelli & Roy, 2022; Hebert et al., 2022; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Mohmmed et al., 2020; Slimi, 2020). The concept of care-informed pedagogy has since emerged as a foundational framework to address the online education and ERT- associated challenges (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).

This rationale outlines key justification for conducting the present study, centering on integrating care pedagogy into ERT faculty development for higher education settings. First, in the ERT context, students face isolation, stress, anxiety, and other challenging circumstances (Al Sulaimi, 2022; Maican & Cocoradă, 2021; Qiu et al., 2020; Zhai & Du, 2020). Therefore, the care pedagogy framework is presented and introduced to meet students' emotional and psychological needs. This care-focused faculty development design may help to mitigate negative consequences or emotions (e.g., stress, anxiety, isolation, & fear) resulting from a sudden shift to online teaching or remote teaching environments.

Second, as mentioned earlier, emergency remote teaching involves a quick and sudden shift to an online modality in response to an emergency, and does not have to be related to a pandemic only. It may occur in response to any natural disaster (e.g., floods, earthquakes, cyclones, and wars). Implementing a flexible and caring pedagogy during ERT is a quick solution and effective strategy to ensure continuity of education and students' success (Hodges et al., 2020).

Third, because faculty are the carriers of knowledge who facilitate learning, their competence directly impacts the quality of online education delivered to students in remote environments. Thus, incorporating the care pedagogy in their development and preparedness is extremely important to equip them with the skills and knowledge to deliver efficient ERT and has the potential to maximize learning outcomes (Burke & Larmar, 2020; Bunger, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).

Fourth, care-oriented pedagogies help to foster students' well-being and promote motivation, engagement, and retention (Al Sulaimi, 2022; Bunger, 2021; Zuo & Ives, 2022). Finally, by integrating

care pedagogy into faculty development for ERT, faculty develop competencies that can be extended to any online teaching environment including those outside the ERT context. This is true for higher education institutions that do not follow a formalized online teaching delivery system within their educational landscape (Al-Naabi & Al Abri 2021; Covelli & Roy, 2022; Hebert et al., 2022; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Mohmmed et al., 2020; Slimi, 2020).

While care-informed pedagogy has received significant attention in the educational field, there has been a dearth of literature investigating its implementation in faculty development for the ERT context (Al Sulaim, 2022; Bungler, 2021; Burke & Larmar, 2020; Robinson et al., 2020). In closing, the present study sought to contribute to the growing body of FD in ERT literature. It emphasized and underscored the importance of placing students' well-being, safety, and comfort at the forefront of pedagogical practices.

Research Question

This study is guided by the following research question: R.Q. What guidelines could be recommended to integrate care pedagogy for faculty professional development and training to optimize their experience within any ERT setting?

Summary

This chapter outlined some background information for the study. It began with describing some emergency remote teaching challenges. Second, the problem statement that this study sought to investigate and solve was then provided. Additionally, the purpose of the study, study rationale, and the main research question were also discussed in detail. A review of the literature will be discussed in the upcoming sections of Chapter Two.

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter begins with providing a definition of care. Then it describes caring behaviors by educators within the context of traditional education and highlights the role of caring in online education and emergency remote teaching. Additionally, this chapter briefly discusses the distinction between emergency remote teaching and planned remote teaching. This chapter also highlights several research studies, and is organized into themes and headings related to different topics pertinent to faculty development for online teaching and targeted professional development for emergency remote teaching. Care in relation to cultural competencies and faculty development is also discussed. Further, the chapter outlines a discussion of faculty development and institutional support. Finally, this chapter concludes with a description of the theoretical frameworks guiding this research study.

Defining Care Pedagogy

In the feminist literature, caring has been characterized as a feminine approach that is, “rooted in receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness” (Noddings, 2012, p. 2). Caring is described as a reciprocal relationship between two involved parties - the “one-caring” and the “cared-for.” Care is complete when it is satisfied on both sides, meaning the response of the cared for completes the caring relation or encounter. Care has also been defined as, “a state of mental suffering or of engrossment: to care is to be in a burdened mental state, one of anxiety, fear, or solitude about something or someone” (Noddings, 2012, p. 9). Further, to care, “may mean to be charged with the protection, welfare, or maintenance of something or someone” (Noddings, 2012, p. 9). In addition, universal caring is defined as when we care about everyone, including our inner and outer circles, with varying degrees of care

intensity. Another example of caring is aesthetic caring, which means caring for things and ideas rather than people. There are behavioral indicators, such as smiling or nodding from the cared for, once care is received from the one caring. The ethic of care is broadly appreciated in many disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, education, political science, library science, business, nursing, religion, and bioethics (Noddings, 2012, p. 771). Gordon et al. (1996) offered another definition for care as a, “set of relational practices that foster mutual recognition and realization, growth, development, protection, empowerment, and human community, culture and possibility” (p. 12).

In the teacher-learner relationship, the caring (teacher) has to satisfy the expressed needs of the cared-for (student). The carer cannot simply assume the need of the cared for, as needs must be expressed to be fulfilled. This happens by listening attentively to the cared for, or by having dialogue, critical thinking, a reflective response, and making thoughtful connections (Noddings, 2012, p. 771). In the teaching context, teaching is completed in learning, while caring is completed in reception. When the caring occurs, there is an ethical responsibility from the cared-for to respond and contribute to the caring relationship to make it sustainable and thriving. In other words, “there is a receptivity required of the cared for” (Noddings, 2012, p. 59). Therefore, the cared for “grows” and “glows” (p. 67), meaning the cared for flourishes and thrives in the caring relationship. This sets the stage for motivation, better performance, and achievement of learning outcomes.

The two forms of caring are natural caring and ethical caring. Natural caring happens out of love, while ethical caring occurs out of duty. The first type of care is a prerequisite for the latter. Although the ethic of care has been described as a tough ethic, the one caring shows tenderness towards the cared for. Caring is also described as a virtue that serves both others (other-serving) and the self (self-serving). Noddings (2012) stated that caring, “preserves both the group and the individual” (p. 100).

The ethical idea about caring, whether the obligation is natural or ethical, is to sustain it. Noddings (2012) suggested that men need to learn how to care, and women must learn how to maintain

themselves as ones-caring (p. 128), making it sustainable. There is hope that somebody can learn to care and learn to be cared for (p. 78).

Caring Behaviors in Traditional Higher Education Contexts

In the vibrant landscape of education, educators and professors shoulder the responsibility of building caring relationships and ideals that extend beyond the role of imparting knowledge and information. The literature on caring underscores the benefits of positive, caring relationships on the success of students' academic achievement and learning outcomes. It is believed that caring and motivation are linked, meaning that students tend to achieve high and perform well if they are cared for by their professors (Jaeger-Hauer, 2021; Jones, 2018; Jones, 2019; Jones, 2021; Motas, 2017; Larsen, 2015). Care literature includes many studies that prove the efficacy of displaying care for students in classroom settings and beyond. Some researchers have distinguished between two different concepts related to caring: academic caring (caring about students' achievement and meeting course objectives) and personal caring (caring about students' well-being) (Jones, 2018; Motas, 2017). Other scholars have investigated different caring behaviors by documenting students' and educators' perceptions of care praxes. For example, Larsen (2015) conducted a qualitative study analysis at a large university where he interviewed twenty students and ten professors about their thoughts and perceptions of care and caring behaviors. The study identified five elements of caring behaviors that professors attempted to showcase and practiced with their students including efforts to learn students' names, efforts to practice care and concern through office hours sessions, efforts to know and understand students' feelings, efforts exerted to create interesting and engaging lessons, and efforts to address students' anxieties during lessons.

Regarding perceived care, the study concluded that there were eight factors found to impact the perception of care in college classrooms. These included, 1) Verbal expressions of care (through saying and telling), 2) Nonverbal expressions of care (facial expressions and eye contact), 3) Identifying

students' names, 4) Displaying care and interest in office hours meetings, 5) Making an attempt to get to know students, 6) Producing intriguing and relevant teachings, 7) Meeting students' needs in class, and 8) Showcasing the existence of a "feeling of care" (Larsen, 2015).

In addition, caring literature shows that there are several constructs of care. One example of a care construct that Larsen (2015) considers to be caring behavior is immediacy. Immediacy means that the educator is approachable and open to students (p. 15). Irrationality is another construct, which indicates that a caring relationship has not been earned or expected (p. 18). This may happen naturally anytime, and anywhere.

Jones (2018, 2019, 2021) is the founder of the MUSIC model for motivation. The letter "C" in the MUSIC model stands for caring strategies. Though it is represented last in the model, the letter "C" carries many meaningful strategies that may be recommended for teachers to care for their students in educational settings. This model shows that students get motivated if they are cared for and feel connected to their learning environment. This occurs when instructors follow caring strategies with learners in classroom settings.

Caring strategies bring together elements of being approachable and relatable, respecting students, caring about their academic achievement, accommodating students, and helping them to fit in (Jones, 2021). Being approachable and relatable includes behaviors such as saying hello, smiling, making eye contact, engaging in "small talk," learning names, holding office hours at different times and in different locations, being friendly, responding quickly, asking students about themselves, educating students about how to deal with their professors, and trying not to appear "smarter" than students.

Making students feel respected, whether face-to-face or online, can occur through establishing ground rules for student-student and student-teacher interactions, permitting students to give feedback on instruction and instructional materials, integrating activities that help students get to know their peers, and recognizing the fact that students have lives beyond the class. Caring about students'

achievement can be exhibited by practicing the following: expressing care about their education/learning, addressing concerns during class, assessing students' thoughts about the course and its content and adjusting accordingly, scheduling individual meetings with students, devoting time to student groups to discuss course content, allocating peer mentoring to provide academic and social support, and allowing space to make an impact and share ideas (Jones, 2021).

In situations of unexpected illnesses and deaths, instructors may consider accommodating students by allowing them to submit assignments late, and having an attendance policy that should not create additional unnecessary work. Finally, they may help students to fit in by connecting a course with other content across disciplines, showing students different roles and career opportunities pertinent to the course content and discipline, building class community by sharing knowledge among students, creating assignments that give the professor/educator a chance to learn about students on a personal level, and providing students with justification for social events that may be threatening or harmful to students' sense of belonging (Jones, 2021).

These strategies from the caring category help students to believe that instructors, and everyone else in the learning environment, care about the academic success of students and their overall wellbeing (Jones, 2019). "Although the MUSIC model was created based on existing motivation theories, it is distinct from other theories because it was developed specifically for instructors to use in designing instruction" (Jones, 2019. p. 2).

"Caring" in Online Education and Emergency Remote Teaching

There is a growing body of research that underscores the significance of care and caring principles in online education. To state an example, Robinson et al. (2017) contributed to the literature by discussing the emerging theme of care-at-the-core, recommending that instructors support online learners by nurturing and helping students through collaborative learning. Other factors recommended for consideration when designing effective collaborative learning included giving extra time, nurturing,

scaffolding, and understanding learners' comfort level with online collaboration. Robinson et al. (2017) also called for the development of a model of care for online teaching and learning, with the intent that it could be implemented by institutions for academic coaching and to guide online teaching faculty.

Burke and Larmar (2020), recognizing that online students sometimes experience isolation and disempowerment, conducted a study to reimagine the learners' online experience in higher education via an online pedagogy of care. Their approach was intended to enhance positive engagement in the online learning space throughout the student lifecycle. Longitudinal student data was collected in the form of qualitative feedback (teaching surveys and spontaneous email communications) within a timeframe of twelve years, from 2013 to 2019. The researchers engaged in a procedure of conversational reflection on their personal online instructional knowledge to express their approaches to implementing pedagogical care values. The findings from the study confirmed that adopting care pedagogy in the online teaching environment is paramount. Therefore, it is essential that faculty be trained, "to develop and implement an intentional approach to pedagogical care" (Burke & Larmar 2020, p. 4) in the online teaching landscape.

In the ERT context, a crucial element that has been considered and recommended in the faculty development literature is humanizing the design and implementing design of care. For example, some studies have suggested implementing a pedagogy that is more inclusive and sensitive to learners' needs. A pedagogy of care encompasses teaching practices that incorporate flexible course requirements, faculty promptness, clear communication, multiplicity of contacts to reach, personal networks, reciprocal care, and learner-centered design and instructional practices (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021). Studies have also highlighted the negative mental health impacts on some students in the emergency remote teaching context including stress, depression, loneliness, and isolation (Maican & Cocoradă, 2021; Qiu et al., 2020; Rubtsova, 2023; Zhai & Du, 2020). To reduce these impacts, instructors need to adopt a mentality of mindful justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI) in the instructional

setting (Bunger, 2021). Prioritizing the design of pedagogical care works towards achieving the JEDI goals (Karakaya, 2021). Bunger (2021) also believed that care pedagogy is a necessary element that has been overlooked in the literature. Other scholars have also recommended teaching with care, empathy, and the use of pedagogical strategies such as rapport-building (Zuo & Ives, 2022).

In an autoethnographic study, Al Sulaimi (2022) studied rapport-building among four university English faculty at the University of Technology and Applied Sciences (including herself). Based on data from the researcher's personal teaching experience and interviews with three of her colleagues, results indicated that during the absence of face-to-face communication between teachers and students, teachers resorted to adopting alternative rapport-building techniques such as email interaction, close listening to students during synchronous class meetings, friendliness, and using humor. However, faculty were not successful in implementing some of the major elements of building rapport such as knowing or recognizing students, praising them, and conducting intervention when required. The findings also revealed that there were some cultural, institutional (heavy workload), and technical (instability and weak network) challenges that hindered faculty attempts to build interpersonal connections with their students.

A study by James et al. (2022), investigated the experiences of 25 instructors in an enabling course at a regional university in Australia. Those educators were enabled to use their personal strategies of care pedagogy with their students at an intra-pandemic time. They asserted that care pedagogy was effective in creating a sense of emotional engagement and a sense of belonging. Based on a care theoretical framework care was used as recognition, where students felt comfortable and "seen" in the online educational environment. Care was also utilized as relational, where faculty showed empathy to students' needs and concerns and implemented care as affective where learners felt safe in the online space. Based on the results, James et al. (2022), recommended replicating the proven pedagogy of care in future educational contexts. ERT generated a physical divide between faculty and

learners (challenge) that forced faculty to pay more attention to their students' personal lives (opportunity). This was a conclusion that was stated by Gelles et al. (2020) in their study on compassionate flexibility and self-discipline during emergency remote teaching. Gelles et al. (2020) conducted a qualitative study in which they interviewed 11 Integrated Engineering students in their second year of study in the Spring of 2020 to investigate their adaptation to the transition to ERT. Their findings revealed that faculty implemented a compassionate, flexible, and caring pedagogy with their students despite the existing pandemic challenges. Students also used self-discipline (e.g., time management) strategies to navigate their way through the transition. The compassionate flexibility of the faculty included personal caring strategies such as emotional support and asking students how they were doing. Faculty flexibility also involved academic caring strategies such as being flexible in grading tests and offering assignments, providing accommodations (allowing P/F grading options), being accessible to students, reducing the workload, giving extra time to complete assignments or tests, grading based on "effort" or "completion" rather than correctness, modifying classes to the new learning format with recognition to ERT hardships (adjusting expectations and displaying leniency), providing prompt responses to email, offering clear and transparent information about what to focus on to be successful, connecting students to people or resources to further assist them, paying attention to gendered responses to ERT (female students got more stressed and pressured because of domestic duties), and asking students for their feedback towards future improvement (Gelles et al., 2020).

Care relationships are equally important not only for students, but faculty who need them to thrive in the online environment during emergency remote teaching. To give an example, David et al. (2023) have asserted that support and care were lacking for faculty during emergency remote teaching. Faculty felt negative emotions such as stress, anxiety, and frustration because they had to deal with many issues in the online environment during the pandemic. They conducted a study in which they administered an interview questionnaire to four hundred faculty during the Spring of 2020. In the

questionnaire, they asked sixty interview questions, and received 26 faculty responses (6.5%). David et al. (2023) recommended the provision of straightforward support strategies such as phone, digital, and face-to-face access to informal counseling sessions, peer support groups, and other discussions to help faculty overcome the negative emotional challenges associated with the transition to online teaching. While the topic of caring for faculty is beyond the scope of this research, the current study is centered on developing and training faculty to provide care for students/learners. The concepts of emergency remote teaching and planned remote teaching are explained next.

Emergency Remote Teaching vs. Planned Remote Teaching

The outbreak of COVID-19 caused many interruptions to educational systems around the globe. Most higher education institutions resorted to terminating face-to-face teaching and implementing ERT to sustain social distancing. In Oman for example, the government declared a state of emergency on March 15, 2020, announcing a similar measure to suspend schools and universities across the country (Al-Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Mohammed et al., 2020; Slimi, 2020).

The distinction between planned remote teaching and abrupt or sudden (emergency) remote teaching is clear and carries useful implications. Emergency remote teaching is a term that was proposed and defined by Hodges et al. (2020) during the COVID-19 pandemic as:

A temporary shift of instruction delivered to an alternate delivery mode due to crisis circumstances. It involves the use of fully remote teaching solutions for instruction or education that would otherwise be delivered face-to-face or as blended or hybrid courses and that will return to that format once the crisis or emergency has abated (para. 13).

Emergency remote teaching involved a sudden switch to online teaching environments that was necessitated by the spread of the pandemic, and complicated by faculty having little to no previous online teaching experience (Covelli & Roy, 2022; Hebert et al., 2022). ERT is characterized and viewed as, “a temporary solution to an immediate problem” (Karakaya, 2021, p.296; Stewart et al., 2022).

In addition to ERT, there are other suggested terms in the literature that have been utilized to characterize the sudden and temporary shift of education to online environments such as emergency remote education (ERE) (Williamson et al., 2020), emergency remote learning (ERL) (Doornbos, 2020), and emergency remote teaching environment (ERTE) (Whittle et al., 2020). The term ERT will be used throughout this study for consistency.

Shifts to emergency remote teaching can occur in response to any emergency, and do not have to be related to public health crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, a rapid pivot to online instruction can be caused by wars or natural disasters such as fires, earthquakes, hurricanes, or cyclones. ERT-based instruction has been used in many countries including Palestine, Syria, Afghanistan, and South Africa due to war and political unrest (Affouneh, Salha, & Khlaif, 2020). Regardless, educational systems should remain prepared for such shifts (Hodges et al., 2020).

On the other hand, planned remote teaching is a structured process for developing an online course (Covelli & Roy, 2022; Sharoff, 2019; Killis & Yildirim, 2019). It encompasses fundamentals like defining the learners, identifying content, deciding which technology tools to implement, selecting instructional materials, and discovering the course learning management system (LMS) (Covelli & Roy, 2022; Simonson et al., 2019). Because “the literature on planned remote teaching post-pandemic is still developing” (Covelli & Roy, 2022, p.77), planning for targeted and tailored professional development for ERT is also emerging.

Faculty Development for Online Education

The terms educational development, professional development, and faculty development may all be used interchangeably to refer to the same concept in the literature (Baker & Lutz, 2021). For consistency, the term “faculty development” will be used throughout this research study. Prior to the pandemic, the literature on faculty professional development was vast. It examined a variety of areas ranging from using universal design principles (UDL) in online course development, faculty developer

initiatives, motivation factors, online instructors' professional development, and online education quality assurance frameworks.

In the context of universal design for learning, Singleton et al. (2019) implemented a qualitative case study design to examine the perspectives of four instructional designers at four research institutions in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The designers were asked about the process of integrating universal design for learning (UDL) strategies into online course development. Universal Design was devised at North Carolina State University's Center for Universal Design by a host of architects, engineers, and environmental designers in 1997. It is based on seven fundamental principles: equitable use, flexibility of use, simple and intuitive use, perceptible information, tolerance for error, low physical effort, and size and space for approach and use (p. 207). Data were collected from participants through semi structured interviews and document reviews. Findings revealed that there were several factors that made the teaching faculty refuse the integration of UDL strategies in their online courses. There was also a small amount of evidence for strategies that were implemented to improve adoption. Some of the inclusive design strategies they encouraged faculty to practice were providing captioned and transcribed videos, designing readable course documents (e.g., Word and PDF) using assistive technology applications such as text-to-speech software, offering options for demonstrating competency (submitting a paper vs. making an oral presentation), and scaffolding.

The techniques proposed were intended to assist with faculty buy in and implementation of inclusive UDL strategies during the design development process. This was done through providing reliable methods towards the integration of UDL strategies in online courses, offering more prescriptive strategies to be employed in online courses, and giving more focus and attention to UDL strategies rather than accessibility (Singleton, et al. 2019).

Another study was conducted by Viberg et al. (2019), which examined and investigated the initiative of faculty developers at KTH Royal Institute of Technology in Sweden. This project design was

innovatively created to support a bottom-up change process that involved faculty as technology enhanced learning (TEL) designers, with the intention of accentuating professional pedagogical development. In this qualitative study, data were aggregated by conducting interviews and analyzing official documents. Results were analyzed by applying Actor-network theory principles. Findings from this study asserted that the project activated practical implementation of digital technology in educational programs. The study also raised a controversial topic of discussion (teachers as designers of TEL) between pedagogical developers and other faculty within the KTH. The findings also highlighted certain challenges (social, organizational, and technical) that should be considered when developing support plans for university faculty as designers of TEL. The study concluded that the project process required a profound comprehension of four reciprocal basic elements: information, technology, organization, and social arrangements. Some of the implications for practice included the following: a need for a critical eye/lens to support university teachers as designers of TEL, continuous encouragement for the bottom-up methods related to faculty pedagogical development in TEL, and recognition for teachers demonstrating teaching excellence as the ones who drive and lead bottom-up initiatives.

Further, Truong and Murray (2019) led a study in which they investigated the motivation factors for online teacher professional development in a setting where professional development is mandatory for in-service teachers. Nineteen semi-structured interviews were conducted with nineteen participants to explore their continuing motivation for PD. The study found that technology, for example, played a key role in motivating teachers; there was also a strong impact of second language motivation on the participating teachers. Still, collaboration among participants remained a challenge. This study concluded by recommending initial training, constant support, and incorporation of interactive learning features as essential components of course design.

In the faculty development literature, the topic of online education quality assurance

frameworks is just as important. An example can be found in a review study conducted by Pedro and Kumar (2020) to analyze thirteen online education quality frameworks used in higher education. The frameworks were created in different countries and regions such as Canada, the US, Mexico, Brazil, South Africa, Africa, Asia, and the European Union. Institutional support takes different forms and fashions, contributing to online faculty success in online instruction. Pedro and Kumar (2020), “identified a lack of systemized knowledge pertaining to instructional services that should be provided by HEI [Higher Education Institution] to assure high quality online teaching” (p. 51).

The institutional support services proposed by the thirteen frameworks to assure quality in online teaching from a faculty point of view were:

- Technologies and technical support: library systems, cloud-based tools, services, and mobile technologies, and continually updated technical support for both faculty and students.
- Online program (course effectiveness or evaluation data): the availability of these data, and having faculty access to help them improve the delivery of their courses and online teaching practices.
- Guidelines/standards for online course design: These guidelines are either developed within the institutions or adopted by renowned professional organizations. Doing so provides structure and guidance not only to faculty who are pivoting to online instruction, but also for those who are revisiting and revising existing online courses.
- Administrative and academic support for online students: Administrative procedures involve different tasks such as student admission, registration, and financial guidance. Academic support involves offering tutoring services, online library services, online student advising services, special needs services for online

- students, institutional orientation for online students, and online student orientation to online services/study skills.
- Professional development for full-time and part-time faculty.
 - Instructional design and technical support: Course development (course materials development, graphic design, media development, editing, open educational resources (OER), Learning Management Systems, and intellectual property/copyright support for faculty).
 - Online program management support: Extra accreditation procedures and transfer of study credits.
 - Online education research support: Local and international publications on topics associated with e-learning pedagogies.
 - Recognition for engagement in online education: This may take different forms, such as acknowledgment by the institution through providing compensation, rewards, and promotions or career development.

Pedros and Kumar's study (2020) had some limitations. For example, it was conducted in the public domain and excluded empirical literature that might have included quality guidelines or recommendations for faculty support in online education.

Faculty Development During and Post COVID-19

Faculty development post COVID-19 should adopt a new work model. The pandemic has often been seen as a driver towards positive change in the world of professional and faculty development. As a result of the challenges imposed by the pandemic, COVID-19 has opened a window to novel ideas, such as re-envisioning work modes to advance and elevate faculty development in higher education. Doing so enhances faculty performance and productivity in all tertiary education (Baker & Lutz, 2021).

As a result, “The Age of the Global community” is a term that has been proposed and introduced by Baker and Lutz (2021) to describe a new age of faculty development based on the lessons learned from the pandemic (p. 55).

Literature focused on ERT pedagogy began to emerge globally in 2020, and covered various topics in education (Bond et al., 2021; Stewart et al., 2022; Stewart, 2021). Since then, the literature on faculty development for ERT continues to grow. Examples of topics discussed include teachers’ narratives from early online classrooms and professional development (Aktar et al., 2022), instructors’ TPACK knowledge during ERT (Çakıroğlu et al., 2023), faculty perspectives towards ERT (Erdem-Aydin, 2021), transitions from emergency remote teaching to sustained remote teaching (Stewart et al., 2022), and design considerations during ERT (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021), among others.

The ERT faculty development has been enhanced through faculty reflections and narrative frames. To illustrate an example, Aktar et al., (2022) conducted a qualitative study exploring how the COVID-19 pandemic impacted higher education in the context of developing Bangladesh. They employed a narrative inquiry methodology with four TESOL teachers from four public and private universities in Bangladesh. The four narrating teachers told their stories, sharing their lived experiences and narratives of doing, undertaking, adjusting, and adopting the virtual classrooms during emergency remote teaching to ensure the continuity of their students’ education. Despite the extremely difficult challenges of low-resources, weak internet connection, and no prior online teaching experience, these teachers’ insights and reflections informed higher education pedagogies and faculty development for online education environments in Bangladesh and similar contexts in the Global South.

In another study, a group of Turkish researchers (Çakıroğlu et al., 2023) administered an online survey to 231 faculty at 20 higher education institutions in Turkey. Faculty were asked about their perceptions towards their growth and enhancement of technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) during emergency remote teaching. To clarify, the TPACK conceptual framework is a model that

has been used by Koehler and Mishra (2009) in the online education environment. TPK refers to faculty knowledge of technologies and their implementation in instruction using proper pedagogy; TCK involves understanding the affordances of technologies within a subject matter or topic to be taught; PCK involves knowledge of the content to be taught and the pedagogy, which is comprised of successful instructional strategies to guide instructors. Findings showed that faculty perceived their knowledge in non-technological areas (PK, CK, and PCK) to be comparatively greater than their technological knowledge dimensions (TK, TPK, and TCK). They recommended training for the faculty related to the TPACK conceptual framework in emergency settings. Overall, the study concluded that the pandemic opened the door to new opportunities to practice ERT and evaluate the challenges resulting from the sudden switch to online education.

In another study by Erdem-Aydin (2021), instructors' perspectives towards emergency remote teaching were investigated and analyzed based on the framework of the socioecological model (SEM). The findings indicated the usefulness and effectiveness of the model to describe the viewpoints of the different stakeholders related to ERT. Faculty also perceived the ERT as a temporary situation that was not going to last forever, and expected a return to normalcy.

Nomnian (2022) conducted a qualitative case study to draw data from staff, faculty, and postgraduate students about their experiences and perspectives on ERT in the MA Program in Language and Intercultural Communication at a research-based university in Thailand. The study identified four key components, comprising faculty staff, postgraduate students, instructional practices, and institutional support. This investigation was significant for researchers, program administrators, and policymakers in that it proposed potential resolutions for policy as well as pedagogical implications that could assist faculty, staff, and students during and post-pandemic.

Stewart et al., (2022) presented the findings from a comparative semester study based on a conceptual framework of performance improvement theory. In their investigation, they reported and

confirmed improvements in performance (output) when faculty were transitioned from ERT contexts into sustained remote teaching (SRT) settings with the help of continuous training, support, and development. They concluded that, through sustained inputs of experience, knowledge, comfort, and expertise, the intervention should generate a measurable change in instructors' teaching behavior in ERT-based environments.

In response to the worldwide pandemic, most educational institutions experienced some need to transition to online or blended/hybrid delivery modes either in an emergency capacity, or as a part of regular operations (Stewart et al., 2022 p. 75). Thus, there is a need to reconsider developing, "new and accessible faculty development opportunities regardless of modality" (Crespín-Trujillo & Hora, 2021, p. 20). The pivot to remote online instruction was swift for instructors, and many had minimal training. They had to immediately adapt to ERT situations by familiarizing themselves with online pedagogy and technology tools to deliver remote instruction. Some of the factors that impacted faculty utilization of instructional technology were their self-efficacy, beliefs and viewpoints about technology, institution-based practices and norms, and heavy workload.

Some of the considerations that have been proposed by Crespín-Trujillo and Hora (2021) during an ERT situation were to apply and expand pass/fail grading options, extend withdrawal deadlines, offer course flexibility to ease students' stress, and provide more accommodations for assignments, attendance, and grading to help students navigate challenges during the global pandemic (p. 14). In relation to institutional support and for credential purposes, higher education institutions should enforce expertise in online instruction as a mandatory requirement for faculty, and could mandate professional development on this skill (Crespín- Trujillo & Hora, 2021).

It is also important to support and encourage "crisis-specific training" for nonacademic interactions during ERT (Walsh et al., 2021, p. 10; Dragisich, 2020). In a study by Walsh et al., (2021), it was found that participating faculty played a role similar to that of social workers in terms of trying to

assist students who were grieving and experiencing socioeconomic, technological, mental, and health problems. The faculty served the students by helping them find the support and the resources they needed to navigate their way through the ERT situation.

Care in Relation to Cultural Competencies and Faculty Development

The language of care is a universal language, meaning that all of us are born with an ethic of natural care for individuals around us with varying levels of care intensity. Care exists in all cultures, no matter what your cultural background is (Noddings, 2012). The literature has emphasized the significance of humanizing the design of instruction while underscoring cultural considerations (Karakaya, 2021; Mehta & Aguilera, 2020). If faculty keep these principles in mind and apply them with learners both within and outside classroom settings, it means that faculty not only care about learners via natural care, but also via ethical care (Noddings, 2012).

The quick transition to emergency remote teaching has been described as pivoting, or as a pivot. The term pivot (a swift turn or rotation) implies that the process of shifting to emergency remote teaching might bring about some negative sentiments and experiences of stress, anxiety, frustration, and helplessness (Lockee, 2020). During the ERT period, learners experienced an absence of technology access and internet reliability. This may have caused a breakdown in emotional communication between students and faculty (Karakaya, 2021).

Students' needs and feelings should be acknowledged and recognized by building a landscape of empathy (Baran & AlZoubi, 2020; Karakaya, 2021; Lockee, 2020), alongside many other design considerations and principles such as simplicity, flexibility, and accessibility (Lockee, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic age has been perceived as a time of crisis and emergency. Thus, the literature has called for scholarship (insights and principles) with the aim of guiding faculty in the process of managing this crisis and emergency (Knox & Haupt, 2020; Yeo et al., 2017). One example has been a recommendation to adopt an approach of cultural competency for faculty development in the

wake of emergency and crisis (Feldmann-Jensen et al., 2019; Knox, Emrich, & Haupt, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020). Before proceeding, the definitions for both culture and competencies are presented here. First, culture has been defined as a set of, “shared values, meanings, beliefs, and norms of a particular group” (Yeo et al., 2017, p. 1). Competencies refer to, “knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs)” (Knox & Haupt, 2020, p. 27).

Although some scholars have contested that cultural competency is an underlying element that is implicit within each KSA, some scholars recommended making it explicit (Knox & Haupt, 2020, p. 28). Once cultural competencies are recognized and cultural considerations are acknowledged, the conclusion may occur that care has been applied and practiced (Karakaya, 2021; Knox & Haupt, 2020). On the other hand, a cultural approach to emergency management means: A systemic process incorporating cultural knowledge, awareness or sensitivity, attitudes, skills, and encounters in order to provide both effective and appropriate care, relief, support, and services to diverse communities at risk from disasters and crises (Yeo et al., 2017, p. 1).

Emergency and crisis management is considered to be a fairly new discipline. Because of this, there is an absence of empirical research on instruction, particularly for cultural competence (Feldmann-Jensen et al., 2019; Knox, Emrich, & Haupt, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020). Therefore, current empirical studies and descriptive research call for scholars and practitioners to acknowledge and apply cultural competence throughout all stages of emergency and disaster management (Edwards, 2012; Knox & Haupt, 2020).

Cultural knowledge and competencies may include social justice, equity, and inclusion (Mehta & Aguilera, 2020). They denote diversity, sensitivity to students’ identity, and providing access to support during times of crisis for all individuals regardless of differences in socioeconomic status, age, ability, race, culture, gender, and religion (FEMA, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020). FEMA’s report (2019, p. 34) specifies four leading standards to construct cultures of preparedness, contribute to enhancing cultural

competence, and make these cultures sustainable. These are trust (established through recognition of history, culture, and context), inclusion (involving the perspectives of all stakeholders), cross-cultural communication (understanding encounters with cross-cultural communication), and support for local practice and its success (building upon existing powers inside the community). Another cultural competency that is viewed as a cultural characteristic is collectivism, which involves doing work in groups as opposed to individualism (doing work individually). Collectivism demonstrates high values, while individualism demonstrates low values (Aparicio, 2016).

In closing, integrating cultural competency is an effective approach to managing emergencies and crises. Doing so shows evidence of care. Faculty who come from diverse backgrounds do not impose the existence of “a culturally competent faculty” (Knox & Haupt, 2020, p. 36). Instead, they need to be developed and trained.

Faculty Development and Institutional Support

Institutional support for faculty development is crucial for the success of both educators and educational institutions. The literature has discussed many benefits of this support at the academic and institutional levels. Redstone and Luo (2021) operationalized Baran and Correia’s (2014) complete Professional Development Framework for Online Teaching (PDFOT) by using a questionnaire to collect data at a large institution in the United States. The framework describes the effectiveness of online teaching as being the product of the interactions and collaboration between three types of support. These are organizational (outer), community (middle), and teaching (inner). Each level of support is explained herein (Baran & Correia, 2014, p. 97). First, organizational support refers to rewards, recognition, and any constructive organizational philosophy towards online education. Second, community support relates to collegial learning groups, peer support programs (peer- observation and peer evaluation), and mentoring programs. Finally, teaching support (technology, pedagogy, content) relates to workshops, training programs, and vis-à-vis help.

Redstone and Luo's (2021) findings indicated a need to reinforce support at the teaching, community, and organizational levels. Institutional support can also take the form of release time and academic promotion (Al Wardy, 2020), or the provision of faculty training (Walsh et al., 2021). In their study, Walsh et al., (2021) stressed that there were some difficulties that professional development experts and providers should prioritize, namely internet access, time management, and minimizing transactional distance. For experienced online teaching faculty, they proposed faculty development training on how to deal with negative students' behavior and adaptation expectations during times of catastrophe. They also suggested providing faculty development training for inexperienced instructors on online teaching pedagogy and enhancing technological skills.

Theoretical Frameworks and Models

To provide a foundational basis for the design and development research, Richey and Klein (2007) have offered their perspective that the design and development knowledge base has six fundamental components, each centered on the design and development organization. These are as follows: a) learners and how learning occurs, b) learning and performance context, c) content nature and how it is arranged in a sequence, d) the instructional techniques and activities recruited, e) technology tools and delivery methods implemented, and f) the designers and the process they follow. This knowledge base has been formed over time via a web of foundational research, theory involving different disciplines, and research and theory exclusive to instructional design and development. The most impactful among them are, "psychological and learning theory and research," "instructional theory and teaching-learning research," and "communication theory and message design research" (p. 4). To clarify, learning operations in the instructional design were initially grounded in behavioral justifications. They were then grounded in cognitive principles and finally in constructivism, which offers the perspective that learners construct learning and experiences rather than acquiring them. From instructional theory and teaching-learning research, there are the guiding principles of structure and

sequence of content, instructional activities, and selection of media (Gagne, 1985). Communication theory and message design research is guided by media and delivery systems (e.g., page layout, screen design, graphics, & visual design) (Richey and Klein, 2007, p. 5). Overall, this has been an overview of some of the theoretical foundations in the field of design and development research.

Noddings' Caring Ethic and Moral Education

Regarding caring, early research on the significance and impacts of care in education began as early as 1938 and 1965 in the work of Dewey (Robinson et al., 2020). Later, care theories emerged with the scholarly works of Gilligan (1982), Noddings (1984), and the works of Martin (1992). For this study, the work of feminist philosopher of education and scholar Nel Noddings' (1984) on Caring theory and Moral education will be utilized as a guiding framework.

As previously mentioned, the present study is grounded in Noddings' (1984) caring theory and moral education framework as a foundational basis for the integration of care pedagogy into the ERT faculty development landscape at higher education levels. Noddings described the nature of caring relationships and described them as cyclical in nature. That is, the cared-for communicates a need or necessity, and the carer responds to him and meets his needs with available resources (Robinson et al., 2020; Noddings, 2012a). Within the framework of Moral Education, Noddings (2010; 2012a; 2012b) proposed a care-informed model of education that consisted of four elements: modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation.

These elements are explained as follows. Modeling means that care is modeled through behavior and actions. Dialogue refers to teachers and students engaging in meaningful conversations (by an exchange of listening and talking). Practice describes teachers' provision of opportunities for students to practice the act of caring, such as granting students time to reflect on their experiences or extending caring to help and support their peers. Cooperative learning and collaborative learning are methods to support this act. Lastly, confirmation describes the act of affirming and encouraging the best in others.

In summary, Noddings (2010, 2012a, 2012b) provided a regulatory framework to guide care-centered educational implications. Her ethics of care theory are mainly centered on traditional education contexts (e.g., primary, and secondary school levels), not in online education settings (Kızılcık & Türüdü, 2022). A theoretical analysis of care applications in an online space is outlined below.

Noddings' Caring Ethics in Educational Technology, Online Teaching, and Emergency Remote Teaching

Early work that investigated the implementation of care principles in an online environment started in the early 1990s. For instance, Damarin (1994) was among the early scholars who tried to explore theoretical applications of caring for online design by instructional designers and technologists. To be consistent with Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) ethics of caring, Damarin (1994) suggested that the products of designers and technologists should not be intended to replace the instructors because in doing so, the caring relationship between the binary would be destroyed. Instead, Damarin (1994) recommended that the products should be designed and transported as resources in a way that might foster the caring ideal between the one-caring (teacher) and the cared-for (student) to ensure the continuation of the caring relationship. She also suggested that the instructional design should begin by acknowledging cultural narratives, objects, artefacts, and procedures of the classroom and the broader society (p. 37). Finally, Damarin (1994) emphasized the need for designers to provide numerous opportunities for learners (the cared-for) to express their learnings and exercise free thinking.

The theme of online caring presence later began to appear in the literature, as a reference to care pedagogy in the online environment (Mastel-Smith, 2015). Some scholars built on Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) theoretical framework and extended the application of care ethics to the contexts of online teaching and online teacher education including ERT (Mastel-Smith et al., 2015; Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021; Robinson et al., 2017; Rabin, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020). Some scholars have found that online learning spaces create a feeling of "decontextualization," in which instructor-centered strategies and distance in the online environment negatively impact relationships (Kızılcık & Türüdü, 2022, p. 143;

Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021; Rabin, 2021; Tang et al., 2021). In online education, a major challenge remains in addressing learners' psychological needs for, "belonging, socializing [and] cooperation" (Markovic et al., 2020, p. 13).

Summary

This chapter began with defining care pedagogy. Second, it described caring behaviors by educators in the context of traditional education. It also highlighted the role of caring in online education and emergency remote teaching. In addition, this chapter discussed the findings from several research studies. It was organized into themes and headings related to different topics pertinent to faculty development for online teaching, and targeted professional development for emergency remote teaching. Care was also explored in relation to cultural competencies, and faculty development was then outlined. Further, a description of theoretical frameworks then followed. The chapter then concluded with a discussion of faculty development and institutional support.

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the proposed research methodology for conducting this study. Further, it outlines background information about the design and development research method, and specifically Type 2 model development research. The chapter also thoroughly defines the procedures followed in creating this research design including instrumentation, and the five main stages of the design and development process: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. The selection process for subject matter expert (SMEs) reviewers, their characteristics, and validity concerns are also fully explained in the following sections.

Research Design

Instructional technology is an empirical and applied field which has frequently been characterized by a distinctive blend of theory and practice. This study employs design and development research methodology. Specifically, this study utilized Type 2 model research (Richey & Klein, 2007) to create faculty development guidelines to integrate care pedagogy at higher education institutions during an ERT context.

Development research has been defined as, “the systematic study of designing, developing and evaluating instructional programs, processes and products that must meet the criteria of internal consistency and effectiveness” (Seels & Richey, 1994, p. 127). Another definition for developmental research is the “systematic study of design, development, and evaluation processes with the aim of establishing an empirical basis for the creation of instructional and non-instructional products, tools, with new or enhanced models that govern their development” (Richey & Klein, 2007, p. 1).

Development research takes different forms which can be categorized into the following: a) the study of

the process and impact of a specific instructional design and development effort; b) a situation in which an individual is performing instructional design, development, or evaluation and studying the process concurrently; or c) the study of the instructional design, development, and evaluation process as a whole or of a specific process component. (Richey, Klein, & Nelson, 2003, p. 1099).

Development in the field of instructional technology means the process or steps taken to produce instructional materials. Design is viewed as the planning phase (specifications are constructed), while development, on the other hand, is viewed as the production phase (specifications are actualized) (Seels & Richey, 1994; Richey, Klein, & Nelson, 2003). In the research context, a development focus includes planning, production of materials, and comprehensive evaluation of the entire process (formative, summative, and confirmative). The field of instructional technology is an applied field, meaning that research lends itself to providing and offering quick solutions for practical societal problems. In design and development research, there are two types of development research: Type 1 & Type 2. Type 1 research emphasizes the study of specific products or program design, development, and/or evaluation projects. The final product comes in the form of lessons learned from developing specific products and conducting an analysis of the conditions that facilitate their implementation. The conclusions reached by the development researcher are context specific. Type 2 research focuses on the study of design, development, or evaluation processes, tools, or models. The ultimate product from this type of research is new design, development, and evaluation procedures and/or models, and the circumstances that govern their implementation. Conclusions from this type of research take the form of generalized knowledge across many disciplines (Richey, Klein, & Nelson, 2003).

Table 1*Types of Development Research in Design and Development Research (DDR)*

TYPE OF RESEARCH	TYPE 1	TYPE 2
DESIGN FOCUS	<i>Study of specific product or program design, development, &/or evaluation projects</i>	<i>Study of design development, or evaluation processes, tools, or models</i>
PRODUCT	<i>Lessons learned from developing specific products and analyzing the conditions that facilitate their use</i>	<i>New design, development, and evaluation procedures &/or models, and conditions that facilitate their use</i>
CONCLUSIONS	<i>Context-specific</i>	<i>Generalized</i>

Note. Adapted from Richey, Klein & Nelson, 2003.

Model research, as defined by Richey and Klein (2007), “pertains to studies of development, validation, and use of design and development models” (p. 10). Further, model research is, “the most generalized of design and development research” (p. 11). For the purposes of this study, the focus was on Type 2 model research which took the form of creating and designing new guidelines for integrating care pedagogy during emergency remote teaching. This step was followed by an SME evaluation and revision procedures to reach better and more effective design outcomes and instructional materials. Thus, this study utilized a model development research method.

Research Procedures

Determining the parameters for research on design and development models is an essential part of the process for this study (Richey & Klein, 2007). For this model development study, the ADDIE Model (analysis, design, development, implementation, & evaluation) was operationalized to create the final product (guidelines design) (Richey et al., 2011). Some consider the expert review and evaluation stage to be a component of the implementation itself. This study also used extant data by conducting a literature search for seminal and relevant articles in the field related to guidelines and best practices

proposed in the field of integrating care pedagogy during an ERT context. The DDR conclusions of this study were presented in the form of generalized knowledge concerning care-focused faculty development at higher education institutions during ERT. In short, this study designed a new tool in the form of a set of guidelines. The five main ADDIE model phases (analysis, design, development, implementation, & evaluation) and revision are described in detail in the upcoming section.

Phase One - Analysis

This phase was characterized by conducting a search for seminal and relevant articles in the literature. There were a variety of topics that have been explored in the arena of care pedagogy and faculty development in online teaching, including emergency remote teaching.

The selection of topics from the literature was strategic and purposeful. Theoretical frameworks and guiding principles were taken from care pedagogy literature, faculty development literature, and the literature of online teaching and/or emergency remote teaching. These selected topics were reviewed and categorized to identify recurring themes that could be used to formulate best practices, frameworks, and guidelines for integrating care pedagogy into faculty development for ERT. This phase (analysis) was preceded by solidifying search strategies and selections from the literature. This procedure has also been peer reviewed by a senior data/evidence synthesis professional at the Newman Library at Virginia Tech. For thorough details on how the search strategies were executed, please see details in Appendix A (p.139).

Search yields were saved into the websites for the ERC, ERIC, and Scopus databases. The saved materials were exported to Zotero, a reference management tool, to be sorted and de-duplicated. Afterwards, all saved items were imported into Covidence software, a systematic review manager, to be screened and reviewed for titles and abstracts, and then for full-text review. In addition to the previously mentioned approaches, two other methods were used to collect data from the literature. One was Google Scholar to locate seminal and related articles or sometimes ebooks. Some of the key

terms that were used for this search were, “care pedagogy in online teaching,” “care pedagogy in higher education institutions,” “guidelines for online teaching and ERT,” and “faculty care for students during emergency remote teaching.” Applying the backward approach of locating other related articles and resources from the references lists of previously reviewed seminal articles was another method that was utilized to locate relevant materials and triangulate additional data.

Phase Two - Design

After the analysis phase, the design phase followed. This step was executed by collecting and synthesizing the findings relating to best practices in the literature (analysis input). A prototype design was created as the final product of this phase. This phase was executed while considering the design for the following items: needs assessment and analysis, measurable goals and objectives, target audience, content analysis, technology and media selection, artifacts creation and development (instructional materials and training sessions), delivery platform(s), delivery modality, and evaluation plans. These design principles and practices were aligned with care-informed pedagogy, best expected outcomes, and ethical concerns. The table below shows a detailed explanation of each of the design considerations.

Table 2

Specified Methodology Design Considerations

Design Consideration	Specification	Technique
Needs Assessment	A thorough needs assessment was administered to identify the main faculty needs and areas where faculty may need support in integrating care pedagogy. This included faculty concerns, challenges, and pain points.	Data for this needs analysis were collected from extant and existing data in the published literature. There was no need to gather input through surveys and interviews.
Measurable Goals & Objectives	Goals and objectives were set to be clear, relevant, measurable, and achievable. Goals were aligned within a specific timeframe.	Define the instructional objectives to be achieved by conducting this faculty development, and that aligned with the themes of care pedagogy, faculty

Design Consideration	Specification	Technique
		development, and emergency remote teaching.
Target Audience	Identify the groups of faculty and individuals who were going to benefit from this care-centered development, while considering their diverse needs and characteristics.	Create faculty user personas to represent the different segments of the audience.
Content Analysis	Analyze content extracted from existing data from the literature based on the learning objectives and the needs of the audience. Ensure that the content was relevant and up-to-date, especially the ones concerned with emergency remote teaching.	Conduct a thorough perusal of the existing data pertinent to care pedagogy, faculty development, and emergency remote teaching.
Technology & Media Selection	Select technology tools that match the learning objectives.	Consider using a mix of technological elements (e.g., video, audio, and interactive modules).
Artifacts Creation & Development (Instructional Materials and Training Sessions)	Develop instructional materials that were aligned with the learning objectives, learner-centered, and engaging.	Utilize instructional design models such as the ADDIE model.
Delivery Platform(s)	Select a delivery platform (learning management system that is readily available at any higher education institution.	Pilot test and gather feedback before full implementation. Provide technical support and training, if needed.
Delivery Modality	Select a delivery modality that is available online and can be adapted for asynchronous, synchronous, and blended learning environments. For onsite delivery, face-to-face workshops and seminars will be offered.	Elicit faculty feedback on their preferred modality. Mixed modalities may also be employed for a balanced learning experience.
Evaluation Plan	An evaluation plan will be established by conducting formative and summative assessments to evaluate the success (process and outcomes) of the program.	Develop rubrics for evaluating learning outcomes. A mechanism for ongoing evaluation will also be implemented.

Phase Three - Development (Operationalization of Theoretical Underpinnings)

This phase focused on the resources and interventions utilized to help faculty integrate care pedagogy into ERT. This phase highlighted the step of bringing the blueprint or prototype in the previous phase (design) into a physical format (Richey & Klein, 2007). The development phase in the DDR, “is the process of translating the design specifications into physical form” (Richey & Seels, 1994, p. 35). These theoretically grounded guidelines and considerations were created and designed based on theoretical underpinnings discussed earlier in Chapter One.

As mentioned earlier, this Type 2 design and development research operationalized the ADDIE Model to create care-focused faculty development guidelines. The ADDIE Model highlights five core elements of the instructional design process: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (Richey et al., 2011). Guidelines for this design and development research were developed by identifying the theoretical components of integrating care pedagogy into faculty development for emergency remote teaching. Noddings (1984) proposed a four-element framework to integrate care pedagogy into education: modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation or affirmation. What follows is an explanation for each one of these elements. Modeling refers to modeling care through behavior and actions (e.g., being available and accessible). Dialogue means that teachers and students engage in an exchange of meaningful conversation (listening and talking). Practice involves teachers providing opportunities for students to practice the act of caring, such as granting students time to reflect on their experiences. Cooperative learning and collaborative learning are other approaches that can be used to support this act. Finally, confirmation signifies the act of affirming and encouraging the best in others.

These elements guided the process of creating care-focused guidelines alongside other evidence related to caring that has been discussed and used in the literature of caring in relation to online teaching and ERT (Damarin, 1994; Mastel-Smith et al., 2015; Robinson et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2020; Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021; Rabin, 2021).

The development of these guidelines was based on the care-centered education model of Noddings (2010, 2012a, 2012b). A description of each theoretical component (Modeling, Dialogue, Practice, & Confirmation) was provided and accompanied by specific examples from the cited literature showing how each care element can be done in an online environment and an ERT context. Then, themes that fell under this category were grouped under each care model. Examples were drawn from the literature to illustrate how each theme should be executed. Finally, matching guidelines were created in alignment with each theme. See Chapter Four for more details. The themes (T) included the following:

Modeling: Approachability and relatedness, instructor presence and availability, deliberate personalization, fostering interest and intrigue, adherence to the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), faculty readiness for online teaching, compassionate flexibility, accessibility, instructional scaffolding, immediacy and promptness, technical competence, institutional support, simplicity and cognitive load reduction, and self-care during times of crisis.

Dialogue: Personalization, timing/promptness, and immediacy, the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), open communication, approachability and relatedness, accessibility, rapport building, institutional support, instructional scaffolding, and instructor presence.

Practice: Peer mentoring, collaboration, and peer-to-peer support, as well as social presence and community building.

Confirmation: Personalization, pacing, and institutional support.

Phase Four – Implementation & Evaluation

In this stage, the created guidelines were collected and presented to a group of eight expert reviewers to be evaluated. The expert reviewers were selected and chosen based on some characteristics that are detailed shortly. The expert reviewers were approached and invited via email invitation letters. Upon their agreement to participate, the IRB research protocol approval, a participant

consent form, the online questionnaire, and accompanying documents related to the study (outlining the purpose, rationale, and some background information) were sent to the reviewers to review, evaluate, and give their feedback on the proposed guidelines. All the related study documents were sent as attachments in an email using Virginia Tech account @vt.edu.

Ethical considerations for protecting participants such as avoiding coercion, maintaining confidentiality, and ensuring anonymity (Richey & Klein, 2007) took priority in this DDR study through compliance with the ethical standards in the ID field and the ethical standards of professional associations such as American Education Research Association (AERA) and American Psychology Association (APA). This DDR study also made sure to adhere to and comply with the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Virginia Tech (See Appendix B).

Phase Five – Revision

Findings based on the reviewers' feedback and suggestions were collected and analyzed for further improvement. See more details in Chapter 5.

Characteristics of the Population

This section outlines some details about the target audience and the expert reviewers' characteristics. Data selection from the literature targeted faculty and instructors from higher education settings. This population included faculty, college instructors, university instructors, college teachers, university teachers, and professors.

Selected subject matter experts (SMEs) or reviewers had certain characteristics for them to be qualified and good candidates for the review. Approaching expert reviewers was a crucial step to validate the guidelines' design. Even though this variable (expertise) has received a lot of attention, its definition has not been standardized across projects (Richey & Klein, 2007).

Since care pedagogy is the subject matter domain of the educational intervention for this study, it is expected that some of the experts approached may not have expertise and knowledge about this

subject matter domain (Nieveen & Folmer, 2013). According to Richey and Klein (2007), experts are defined as those with more than 10 years of experience in the field of expertise such as instructional design, online teaching, or online learning, while novices are those with less than 10 years of experience. In addition to the 10-year rule, the expert designers will be asked to place themselves on an expertise continuum constructed based on the analysis of their design behaviors (actual or self-reported) (Richey and Klein, 2007). Based on these factors, expert reviewers for this study had a ten-year period of expertise in one, or at least an intersection of topics such as instructional design, online teaching, online learning, educational technology, faculty development, emergency remote teaching, and care pedagogy. Expert reviewers had experience working at Virginia Tech and/or another reputable university in the United States or abroad. For this study, the researcher shortlisted some names as good candidates for selection as expert reviewers. More details on the expert reviewers, including their identities and qualifications, are provided in Chapter 5, in the section on expert reviewers' profiles.

Research Tool - Expert Review Questionnaire

To collect data from the expert reviewers, the researcher devised an online questionnaire using the QuestionPro Survey platform (a web-based data collection tool). The online questionnaire was created using the researcher's VT account. The survey itself was divided into five sections: Introduction, Consent Statement, Demographic Information (Reviewers' Profile), Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) care model elements: Modeling, Dialogue, Confirmation and Practice (with accompanying descriptions), and the Survey Conclusion. See more details in Chapter 5.

Establishing Validity - Unique Research Design Concerns

To establish the validity of data and subsequent findings, some measures were taken to address unique research design concerns. Examples of these measures included ensuring that design and development tasks were realistic in scope, predefining criteria that govern the choice of key elements

included in the design, recruiting multiple data sets (comprehensive literature data and expert reviewer data) in order to triangulate data, collecting in-progress data whenever possible, and establishing strategies to easily enable the gathering of accurate and comprehensive extant data (Richey & Klein, 2007). Another validity consideration was ensuring the integrity of the recall data through including a peer review for the structured traditional literature search strategy. This was performed with assistance from a Virginia Tech senior librarian. Accommodating the demands of multiple natural work environments, dealing with a wide range of participant characteristics, and actual or simulated design projects were other design concerns that were considered in the process (Richey & Klein, 2007).

Summary

This chapter described the proposed research methodology conducted to carry out this study. It also outlined background information about design and development research methods, and Type 2 model development research specifically. This chapter also detailed and defined the procedures for creating this research design including instrumentation and the five main stages of design and development: analysis, design, development, implementation and evaluation, and revision. The selection criteria for the subject matter expert (SMEs) reviewers, their characteristics, and methods for establishing validity were also explained.

CHAPTER 4 DEVELOPING GUIDELINES & STRATEGIES FOR INTEGRATING CARE INTO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This chapter explains in detail the steps taken to create and design the guidelines to integrate care pedagogy into faculty development during emergency remote teaching. This chapter also outlines the search strategies impacting how data was collected from extant literature using three electronic databases (Education Research Complete, ERIC, and Scopus) from two interfaces (EBSCOHost and Scopus, respectively). Following this is a thorough description for using the Covidence program to review abstracts and titles, full-text articles, and conduct data extraction. Care-informed themes that aligned with Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) caring elements have been identified and highlighted. Each theme has been substantiated with cited strategies from the literature. Consequently, proposed guidelines have been formulated based on these findings.

Guidelines Development Process

The process of developing the guidelines was characterized by following four major phases. These were: 1) Review and analysis of the literature, frameworks, and best practices of using care pedagogy, 2) Creation of the guidelines and their strategies, 3) Development of the data collection tool (QuestionPro survey) for expert reviewers, and 4) Preparation and organization of the study resources. The next section will elaborate on these phases in detail.

Phase One - Review and Analysis of the Literature

This section outlines a thorough analysis of extant literature data on care pedagogy, faculty development, and emergency remote teaching to identify strategies, frameworks, and best practices for integrating a care-full pedagogy for faculty development to support educators and students in the emergency remote education environment. Following the needs analysis and problem identification, an extensive literature review was conducted using specific search strategies. This process was reviewed and validated by a senior data/evidence synthesis professional at the Newman Library at Virginia Tech. Comprehensive information on the execution of the search strategies can be found in the Appendices.

The search results obtained from the ERC, ERIC, and Scopus databases were saved to their respective websites. These materials were then exported to Zotero, a reference management tool, for sorting and de-duplication. Subsequently, all items were imported into Covidence software, a systematic review manager, for title and abstract screening followed by full-text review.

In addition to the previously referred to strategies, there were two other approaches that were applied to collect data from the literature. One was using Google Scholar to locate seminal and related articles and ebooks. Some of the key terms that were recruited for this search were, “care pedagogy in online teaching,” “care pedagogy in higher education

institutions,” “guidelines for online teaching and ERT,” and “faculty care for students during emergency remote teaching.” Another method that was utilized to locate relevant materials triangulate additional data was applying the backward approach of locating other related articles and resources from the reference lists of previously reviewed seminal articles.

The selection of topics from the literature was planned and determined based on a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria comprised higher education, university faculty, university professors, university instructors, college faculty, college professors and college instructors,

tertiary level, faculty development, and in-service faculty development. The inclusion criteria included full-text peer reviewed journals and ebooks, and publication dates that fell within a period of five years, from 2019 to 2023. The exclusion criteria included K- 12 education, school teachers, teachers' education and preservice teachers' education, and any publication date prior to 2019.

Topics related to theoretical frameworks and guiding principles were extracted from care pedagogy literature, faculty development literature, and the literature of online teaching and/or emergency remote teaching. These topics were reviewed and categorized to identify recurring themes that could be used to formulate best practices, frameworks, and guidelines for integrating care pedagogy into faculty development for ERT.

The analysis and data extraction stages have been iterative processes. The Covidence program, a data synthesis and management tool, was used to streamline the initial review of titles and abstracts, and was followed by a full-text review. Duplicates and irrelevant articles were eliminated, resulting in approximately 60 articles being included in the review. The review process concluded once the core articles had been thoroughly examined, leading to a saturation of themes. Key themes were identified, with an emphasis on care ethics perspectives.

Phase Two – Creation of the Guidelines and Their Strategies

Formulating the guidelines involved five important procedural steps. These included:

1. Conducting an in-depth analysis of pertinent and seminal articles to extract key insights and care-informed themes.
2. Identifying care-related themes in the literature and extracting them.
3. Scrutinizing strategies that supported each theme from literature.
4. Categorizing the identified strategies to correspond to the respective themes.
5. Proposing matching guidelines that aligned with the identified strategies and themes.

The following tables highlight the emergent themes and subthemes that have been underscored and drawn from the literature of care pedagogy, faculty development, and emergency remote teaching. These themes have been displayed in their relation to Noddings’ (2010, 2012a, 2012b) four care elements: Modeling, Dialogue, Practices, and Confirmation.

It is evident from the table that some themes are repeated and can be applied to more than one caring element. For instance, “compassionate flexibility” is applied through modeling, dialogue, and confirmation, while accessibility can be applied through modeling and dialogue. Garrison et al. (1999) detailed three types of presence that the instructor needs to demonstrate in an online environment: cognitive, social, and teaching presence. For cognitive, instructors enhance course content and pedagogical strategies for online learning. For social, the amount of realness is important, meaning how authentic online interactions between the instructor and the learners feel. Lastly, teaching presence is dependent on the faculty capacity to engender an encouraging, welcoming, and caring environment for learning. The table below displays the emergent care-related themes and occurrences within Noddings’ (2010, 2012a, 2012b) care Model.

Table 3
Emergent Care-Related Themes

Emergent Care-related Themes (Academic care & personal care)	Modeling	Dialogue	Practice	Confirmation
Approachability and relatedness, instructor presence and availability, deliberate personalization, fostering interest and intrigue, adherence to the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), faculty readiness for online teaching, compassionate flexibility, accessibility, instructional scaffolding, immediacy and promptness, technical competence, institutional support, simplicity and cognitive load reduction, and self-care during times of crisis	*	*		*
Rapport Building	*	*		
Peer Mentoring			*	
Collaborative learning & Peer to peer support			*	
Social presence & community building	*		*	
Pacing				*
Open communication		*	*	*

The following section presents Table 4, which displays the themes, strategies, and their associated guidelines.

Table 4

Themes, strategies, and their associated guidelines.

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
I. Modeling (Instructors model care through behaviors and actions).	T.I.1: Approachability & relatedness	<p>S.I.1.a: Providing opportunities for synchronous interactions (Robinson et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.1.b: Offering multiplicity of contacts to reach (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021; Sitzman & Leners, 2006).</p> <p>S.I.1.c: Expressing care about their education/learning (Jones, 2021)</p> <p>S.I.1.d: Addressing concerns during class (Jones, 2021)</p>	G.I.1.1: Faculty should be approachable and relatable by offering different synchronous interaction opportunities for learners.
	T.I.2: Instructor presence and availability (Jones, 2021, Robinson et al.,2020). Presence (Cognitive, social & teaching) & and Community Building (Garrison et al., 1999)	<p>S.I.2.a: Sending email reminders (Jones, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.2.b: Showing up and participating on discussion board (Jones, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.2.c: Making frequent touch bases with the learners (Jones, 2021; Robinson et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.2.d: Being available & accessible during time when additional support & guidance are needed (Robinson et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.2.e: Building class community by sharing knowledge among students (Borowiec et al., 2021; Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.2.f: Holding faculty discussions with colleagues to share experiences, and views and allowing for exchanging and learning didactical strategies and approaches to handle conflicts and build a sense of a community. (Green et al., 2020).</p>	G.I.2.1: Instructors should be available and present when needed.
	T.I.3: “Deliberate personalization” (Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021, p.219)	<p>S.I.3.a: Demonstrating efforts to learn students’ names, efforts to practice care and concern through office hours sessions, efforts to know and understand students’ feelings, and efforts to address students’ anxieties during lessons (Larsen, 2015, Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.3.b: Exposing more of personal selves like personal sharing in the online teaching space (e.g., weekend activities or birthday card writing (Lambrev & Cruz, 2021; Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021; Moore, 1993).</p> <p>S.I.3.c: Creating assignments that give the professor/educator a chance to learn about students on a personal level (Jones, 2021)</p> <p>S.I.3.d: Providing personal networks, reciprocal care, and learner-centered design and instructional practices (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021).</p>	G.I.3.1: Faculty should follow personalized methods or techniques when dealing with learners in the ERT online space.
	T.I.4: Creating interest & intrigue.	S.I.4.a: Exerting effort to create interesting and engaging lessons that match young students’ interest (Tolika et al., 2022).	G.I.4.1: Faculty should be creative in creating interesting and engaging lesson plans.

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
	<p>T.1.5: JEDI framework (justice, equity, diversity & inclusion)</p>	<p>S.1.5.a: Showing cultural knowledge and competencies. This may include social justice, equity, and inclusion (FEMA, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020; Mehta & Aguilera, 2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.b: Denoting diversity and sensitivity to students’ identity and providing access to support during times of crisis for all individuals regardless of differences in socioeconomic status, age, ability, race, culture, gender, and religion (FEMA, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020; Mehta & Aguilera, 2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.c: Adopting a mentality of mindful justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI) in the instructional setting (Bunger, 2021; Karakaya, 2021).</p> <p>S.1.5.d: Offering Synchronous activities, creating projects built on students’ interest, offering options for learning representation (Jones, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.e: Allowing space to make an impact and share ideas (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.1.5.f: Providing an opportunity for inclusion by permitting various voices to be heard (Green et al.,2020)</p> <p>S.1.5.g: Accommodating students during emergencies (death & illness) (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.1.5.h: Making students feel respected (Jones, 2021)</p> <p>S.1.5.i: Paying attention to gendered responses to ERT (female students get more stressed and pressured because of domestic duties) (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.j: Being mindful of emotional intelligence, female lower level of computer self-efficacy, attitude, graduate & professional students vs. undergraduate or millennials (JEDI) (Dang & Zhang, 2021).</p> <p>S.1.5.k: Providing students with justification for social events that may be threatening or harmful to students’ sense of belonging (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.1.5.l: Being mindful of cultural considerations and differences (Karakaya, 2021; Mehta & Aguilera, 2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.m: Providing printable materials/resources for learners with low internet connection or using small devices (Green et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.n: Honoring activities and resources that do not require high internet connection (Green et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.1.5.o: Offering differentiated support (Meda & AlBukhari, 2023)</p> <p>S.1.5.p: Scaffolding different needs (Meda & AlBukhari, 2023)</p> <p>S.1.5.q: Being mindful of technology-related gender differences (Dang & Zhang 2021)</p> <p>S.1.5.r: Collaborating with external organizations to cater to the diverse needs of students, scaffolding different needs (Meda & AlBukhari, 2023)</p>	<p>G.1.5.1: Faculty should consider the JEDI framework principles when teaching during ERT.</p>

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
		<p>S.I.5.s: Creating a feeling of safety & comfort (James et al., 2022).</p>	
	<p>T.I.6: Faculty readiness to teach online</p>	<p>S.I.6.a: Spreading awareness that instructors’ experience, and readiness for online teaching play a significant role in creating a climate of care (Robinson et al., 2020)</p>	<p>G.I.6.1: Faculty readiness to teach online should be supported.</p>
	<p>T.I.7: Compassionate Flexibility</p>	<p>S.I.7.a: Removing time pressures from assessment (Gelles et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.b: Allowing learners to submit assignments late (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.7.c: Having an attendance policy that should not create additional unnecessary work (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.7.d: Connecting a course with other content across disciplines (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.7.e: Showing students different roles and career opportunities pertinent to the course content and discipline (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.7.f: Offering emotional support and asking students how they are doing (Gelles et al., 2020; Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.7.g: Being flexible in grading tests and offering assignments (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.h: Providing accommodation (allowing P/F grading options) (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.i: Being flexible and considerate to students by reducing the workload (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.j: Giving extra time to complete assignments or tests, and grading based on “effort” or “completion” rather than correctness (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.k: Modifying classes to the new learning format with recognition to ERT hardships (adjusting expectations and displaying leniency) (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.l: Connecting students to people or resources to further assist them (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.m: Paying attention to gendered responses to ERT (female students get more stressed and pressured because of domestic duties) (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.7.n: Increasing flexibility and mutual understanding of the stress of the current situation of crisis (Barr et al., 2021, p.11).</p> <p>S.I.7.o: Caring about students’ academic achievements (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.7.p: Utilizing low-stakes formative assessment activities (Hess et al., 2022).</p>	<p>G.I.7.1: Faculty should employ compassionate flexibility in their online delivery</p>

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
	<p>T.I.8: Accessibility</p>	<p>S.I.8.a: Ensuring access to class resources (YouTube videos, online labs, or digital access to course readings (Sedlacek et al., 2023).</p> <p>S.I.8.b: Applying accessibility policies to accommodate students’ needs (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.8.c: Being more accessible by using slack or Zoom office hours (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.8.d: Offering asynchronous activities and recording synchronous meetings to guarantee accessibility when learners cannot be present (Hess et al., 2022).</p> <p>S.I.8.e: Providing access to tutorials on advanced features of some publicly used platforms Zoom, Webex, Skype, and Google Meet) (Barr et al., 2021, p.11).</p> <p>S.I.8.f: Communicating compliance regarding academic integrity policies (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.8.g: Providing access to tutorials on advanced features of some widely used platforms Zoom, Webex, Skype, and Google Meet) (Barr et al., 2021, p.11).</p>	<p>G.I.8.1: Faculty should advocate for accessibility whenever possible.</p>
	<p>T.I.9: Instructional scaffolding (Bunger, 2021)</p>	<p>S.I.9.a: Applying copyright law and fair use guidelines/directions when using copyrighted materials (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.9.b: Recognizing the distinctive challenge of online learning in applied courses or courses based on practice (Barr et al., 2021).</p> <p>S.I.9.c: Creating regular schedules and formats for assignments (Barr et al., 2021).</p> <p>S.I.9.d: Setting a limited number of clear learning objectives from the onset of the course and confirming that all activities and assignments are aimed towards reaching those objectives (Barr et al., 2021).</p> <p>S.I.9.e: Commencing with a “low stake” learning task, with a hint of fun; it helps boost the affective mood factor (Green et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.9.f: Giving extra time, nurturing, scaffolding, and understanding learners’ comfort level with online collaboration (Robinson et al., 2017).</p>	<p>G.I.9.1: Faculty should demonstrate instructional scaffolding in the ERT space.</p>
	<p>T.I.10: Immediacy and promptness (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021;Sitzman; Larsen, 2015;Leners, 2006).</p>	<p>S.I.10.a: Providing prompt responses to email (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.I.10.b: Responding in a timely and personalized approach (Moorhouse& Tiet, 2021).</p>	<p>G.I.10.1: Faculty should be immediate and prompt in responding to students’ questions and concerns.</p>

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
	<p>T.I.11: Technical competence (Bolliger & Halupa, 2022)</p>	<p>S.I.11.a: Providing resources and relevant materials (Velasques et al., 2013).</p> <p>S.I.11.b: Utilizing visual cues (for learners & educators) to signal navigation (e.g. using icons in a PDF to indicate the location of a task, breakouts, plenary (meeting), and polling sites) (Green et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.11.c: Creating and editing videos (Screencastomatic & Panopto) (Bolliger & Halupa, 2022).</p> <p>S.I.11.d: Accessing online help desk/resources for help (Bolliger & Halupa, 2022).</p> <p>S.I.11.e: Teaching the utilization of virtual communication tools, topics can be regularity of communication, tone, professional video conferencing conventions (backgrounds, use of microphones/headsets, camera placing (Barr et al., 2021, p.11).</p>	<p>G.I.11.1: Faculty should demonstrate technical competence to handle all technical challenges and issues that might face students.</p>
	<p>T.I.12: Institutional support</p>	<p>S.I.12.a: Teaching and covering topics on self-directed learning, motivation, Internet self-efficacy, online communication self-efficacy, and learner’s agency (Hung et al., 2010; Xie & Rice, 2021)</p> <p>S.I.12.b: Teaching the utilization of virtual communication tools, topics can be frequency of communication, tone, professional video conferencing conventions (backgrounds, microphones use/headphones camera placing) (Barr et al., 2021, p.11).</p>	<p>G.I.12.1: Faculty should offer Institutional support by advising learners on self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and motivation and educating them on the use of virtual communication tools.</p>
	<p>T.I.13: Simplicity and cognitive load reduction</p>	<p>S.I.13.a: Keeping it simple by chunking materials up into a few elements at a time (Green et al.,2020).</p> <p>S.I.13.b: Cutting down on “Zoom fatigue” by having synchronous video conferencing supplemented by asynchronous activities (Ross & DiSalvo, 2020)</p> <p>S.I.13.c: Sharing simplified resources, being observant instructor (Moorhouse& Tiet, 2021).</p> <p>S.I.13.d: Reducing courseload to account for the expanded workload of remote teaching & learning (Hess et al., 2022)</p> <p>S.I.13.e: Dropping some assignments or dropping exams Johnson et al. (2020).</p> <p>S.I.13.f: Being mindful of cognitive load and being flexible to students by reducing the workload (Gelles et al., 2020).</p>	<p>G.I.13.1: Faculty should practice simplicity and course load reduction.</p>
	<p>T.I.14: Self-care during time of crisis (Altillo et al., 2020; Pate, 2020)</p>	<p><i>Pete (2020) has proposed these self-care strategies.</i></p> <p>S.I.14.a: Creating a new normal.</p> <p>S.I.14.b: Practicing self-awareness.</p> <p>S.I.14.c: Being optimistic and solution minded.</p> <p>S.I.14.d: Fostering openness, flexibility, adaptability, and sense of humor.</p> <p>S.I.14.e: Initiating contact with learners and their families.</p> <p>S.I.14.f: Being intentional about connecting with colleagues.</p> <p>S.I.14.g: Attending to physical and social limits.</p>	<p>G.I.14.1: Faculty should always exercise self-care and during times of crisis.</p>

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
		<p>S.I.14.h: Setting boundaries for work.</p> <p>S.I.14.i: Considering social-emotional and mental well-being.</p> <p>S.I.14.j: Being mindful of news and media intake.</p>	
<p>II. Dialogue (Having conversations and open communication with learners).</p>	<p>T.II.1 Personalization</p>	<p>S.II.1.a: Maintaining privacy by using personal communications through utilizing the affordances of email correspondences as opposed to discussion forums (Robinson et al., 2020)</p> <p>S.II.1.b: Establishing ground rules for student-student and student-teacher interactions and recognizing the fact that students have lives beyond the class (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.II.1.c: Faculty offering self-disclosure, freeing from judgment, willingness to connect, and believing in students (Lambrev & Cruz, 2021; Mastel-Smith et al. 2015; Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021; Velasques et al., 2013).</p> <p>S.II.1.d: Putting cameras on and sharing personal lives with learners (Kızılçık & Türüdü, 2022).</p> <p>S.II.1.e: Ensuring communications with students by having one-on-one interaction! (Sedlacek et al., 2023)</p>	<p>G.II.1.1: Faculty should maintain students’ privacy by giving them a chance to communicate with them using email correspondence.</p>
	<p>T.II.2 Timing/promptness & immediacy</p>	<p>S.II.2.a: Providing timely responses - specific times of the course when a high level of care is needed to be expressed by dialogue (Robinson et al., 2020).</p>	<p>G.II.2.1: Faculty should respond promptly to students’ questions and concerns.</p>
	<p>T.II.3 JEDI framework</p>	<p>S.II.3.a: Giving learners opportunities to provide feedback on course design and course delivery to make sure expectations and needs are met (Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.II.3.b: Eliciting learners’ feedback on course design & delivery and asking students for their feedback towards future improvement (Gelles et al., 2020; Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.II.3.c: Permitting students to give feedback on instruction and instructional materials and soliciting feedback from learners (Rabin.2021)</p> <p>S.II.3.d: Providing different approaches for students to use technology tools to share their views, questions, concerns, and feedback on course content, activities, and tasks (Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021).</p>	<p>G.II.3.1: Faculty should be mindful of JEDI framework considerations in the ERT setting.</p>
	<p>T.II.4 “Open communication” (Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021, p.220)</p>	<p>S.II.4.a: Being mindful of tone in communication, providing various conversation/dialogue (Bolliger & Halupa (2021).</p> <p>S.II.4.b: Delivering clear communication (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021).</p> <p>S.II.4.c: Engaging in an open-ended dialogue to reach mutual understanding of learners’ experience in the course (Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.II.4.d: Using a team communication app. (Slack) (Al-Freih, 2021)</p> <p>S.II.4.e: Establishing class group on instant messaging platform (Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021).</p> <p>S.II.4.f: Increasing student-faculty virtual interactions through collaboration tools (discussion boards, virtual office hours, & swift email responses.</p> <p>S.II.4.g: Offering clear and transparent information about</p>	<p>G.II.4.1: Faculty should follow open and effective communication policy.</p>

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
		<p>what to focus on to be successful (Gelles et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.II.4.h: Providing different approaches for students to use technology tools to share their view, questions, concerns, and feedback on course content, activities, and tasks (Moorhouse & Tiet, 2021)</p>	
	<p>T.II.5 Approachability & relatedness</p>	<p>S.II.5.a: Using synchronous web-conferencing tools (Canvas Conference, REEL, Skype) to allow learners different modalities to approach faculty (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021).</p> <p>S.II.5.b: Structuring and organizing the course, putting routine check- ins with students, and setting up networks for multimodal communications (Hess et al., 2022).</p> <p>S.II.5.c: Creating and moderating discussion forum (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021)</p>	<p>G.II.5.1: Faculty should be approachable and relatable.</p>
	<p>T.II.6 Accessibility</p>	<p>S.II.6.a: Ensuring access to instructor time through virtual office hours (Zoom), or unstructured meeting times after class (Sedlacek et al., 2023)</p>	<p>G.II.6.1: Faculty should be accessible to all learners.</p>
	<p>T.II.7 Rapport-building (Zuo & Ives, 2022; Al Sulaimi, 2022)</p>	<p>S. II.7.a: Practicing the following approaches: Email interaction, close listening to students during synchronous class meetings, friendliness, and using humor (Al Sulaimi, 2022)</p> <p>S. II.7.b: Demonstrating patience (Sedlacek et al., 2023).</p> <p>S.II.7.c: Focusing on and bringing the affective factor to the front by offering space to discuss issues anonymously, if possible (Green et al., 2020).</p>	<p>G.II.7.1: Faculty should build rapport among learners.</p>
	<p>T.II.8 Institutional support P/D</p>	<p>S.II.8.a: Covering topics on self-directed learning, motivation, Internet self-efficacy, online communication self-efficacy, and learner's agency (Hung et al., 2010; Xie & Rice, 2021).</p> <p>S.II.8.b: Encouraging and supporting self-directed learning. Self-directness can be enhanced by advising and reflective practices (daily journaling about learners' learning practices (Barr et al., 2021)</p>	<p>G.II.8.1: Faculty should enhance learners self-directed learning, self-regulation, and self-efficacy through chats and conversations with students.</p>
	<p>T.II.9 Instructional scaffolding</p>	<p>S.II.9.a: Assessing students' thoughts about the course and its content and adjusting accordingly (Garrison et al., 1999; Robinson et al., 2020).</p>	<p>G.II.9.1 Faculty should demonstrate instructional scaffolding in the ERT space.</p>
	<p>T.II.10 Instructor presence (Cognitive, social & teaching), availability, and community building (Garrison et al., 1999; Robinson et al., 2020).</p>	<p>S.II.10.a: Scheduling individual meetings with students (Garrison et al., 1999; Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.II.10.b: Devoting time to student groups to discuss course content (Garrison et al., 1999; Robinson et al., 2020).</p> <p>S.II.10.c: Integrating activities that help students get to know their peers (Jones, 2021).</p> <p>S.II.10.d: Giving extra time, nurturing, scaffolding, and understanding learners' comfort level with online collaboration when designing collaborative online activities (Robinson et al., 2017).</p> <p>S.II.10.e: Building intentional communities among students and between students and faculty via setting structured synchronous discussions (Hess et al., 2022).</p>	<p>G.II.10.1: Faculty should enhance presence (cognitive, social, & teaching) and community building.</p>
<p>III. Practice (Improving the learning experience by extending the learners' capacity to care and support their peers by</p>	<p>T.III.1 Peer Mentoring</p>	<p>S.III.1. a: Allocating peer mentoring to provide academic and social support (Jones, 2021).</p>	<p>G.III.1.1: Faculty should assign a role of mentoring for online learners with their peers.</p>

Caring Element Description	Theme (T)	Strategy (ies) cited from the literature	Guidelines(s) Proposed
playing the role of the teacher, carer)			
	T.III.2 Collaboration/Peer-to-peer support	S.III.2. a: Providing opportunities for learners to create caring relations by encouraging and monitoring their caring behaviors (Robinson et al., 2020) S.III.2. b: Encouraging collaborative learning (Robinson et al., 2017). S.III.2. c: Using collaboration tools such as Google Drive and One Drive (Robinson et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2020)	G.III.2.1: Faculty should encourage their learners to support their peers and care for them.
	T.III.3 Social presence & community building	S.III.3. a: Using some applications for online discussion (peer blogs, video conference, or groupwork) (Akcaoglu & Lee, 2106; Knapp, 2018, Rabin, 2021). S.III.3. b: Allowing novice-apprentice interactions by adopting team teaching (Green et al.,2020).	G.III.3.1: Faculty should enhance social presence and community building through group work activities and video conferencing.
IV. Confirmation (Confirming and affirming best behaviors and qualities in others).	T.IV.1 Personalization	S.IV.1.a: Demonstrating personalization occurs by showing interest in the students’ goals (Robinson et al., 2020) and affirming students’ abilities (Rabin, 2021). S.IV.1.b: Giving personalized feedback (Robinson et al., 2020). S.IV.1.c: Delivering positive & personalized comments (Sitzman & Leners, 2006). S.IV.1.d: Presenting qualitative vs. quantitative feedback (Robinson et al., 2020). S.IV.1.e: Providing comments and written feedback rather than a score (Robinson et al., 2020).	G.IV.1.1: Faculty should personalize their feedback approaches when confirming their learners’ best behaviors and qualities.
	T.IV.2 Pacing	S.IV.2.a: Pacing between assessing and grading assignments instead of doing it all simultaneously. (Robinson et al., 2020) Example: Providing feedback on assignments (e.g. seven days from submission) (Bolliger & Halupa,2021).	G.IV.2.1: Faculty should pace between assignments and their grading.
	T.IV.3 Institutional support / Professional Development	S.IV.3.a: Covering topics on self-directed learning, motivation, Internet self-efficacy, online communication self-efficacy, and learner’s agency (Hung et al., 2010; Xie & Rice, 2021) S.IV.3.b: Getting institutional support is represented through the role of instructional designers in prioritizing faculty needs on multiple levels and their responsiveness to meet them (Rausch et al., 2022).	G.IV.3.1: Faculty should help learners enhance their online experience by covering topics such as self- directedness, self-regulation, and self-efficacy.

Note: Some strategies recur across several themes because the researcher thinks they can be applicable to more than one theme.

Phase Three - Preparing Survey Questions for the Expert Reviewers

Crafting the survey instrument questions followed a foundational research procedure. Drawing

on care-informed themes and corresponding strategies, the survey questions were designed to align with each theme. Initially created in an MS Word document, the questions were organized according to the four major care models: Modeling, Dialogue, Practice, and Confirmation. The survey was comprised of five main sections: Introduction, Consent Statement, Demographic Information (participant profiles), Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) care model elements (each with its description), and the End of the Survey.

The questionnaire underwent an iterative design process with refinements to reach its final version. All questions were then transferred to the QuestionPro platform for design and implementation. In addition, the thirty proposed guidelines and their accompanying 136 strategies were incorporated into the QuestionPro survey to provide ease of access and convenience to the participants (expert reviewers). For each theme, the survey included a question that asked, "Based on the above strategies, do you find this guideline effective? Why?" Respondents could choose 'yes' or 'no' and provide comments and feedback in a blank space for either response. Also, at the end of each care model, there was an open space to provide any suggestions for guideline improvements, resulting in a total of fifty-two question items. A pilot test of the survey was conducted to evaluate the survey's effectiveness and functionality, and to establish validity before large-scale distribution. In this pilot, five graduate students provided feedback on the design, content, and clarity of the questions, while two faculty members responded to two care model (practice and confirmation) questions to offer comparative insights. The pilot test was conducted over approximately two weeks, with feedback incorporated as needed and as appropriate.

Phase Four – Organizing Resources for the Expert Reviewers

This step involved gathering all the necessary research documents including the IRB approval letter and the informed consent document, which contained 14 items related to the purpose of the

study, rationale, how the findings would be handled, eligibility, procedures, time commitment, risks, benefits, anonymity and confidentiality, compensation, freedom to withdraw, participants' responsibilities, participants' consent, and questions and concerns.

A recruitment letter was also prepared and sent along with these documents to the eleven expert reviewers in the initial invitation email. Upon receiving confirmation from the reviewers about their willingness to participate, a follow-up email was sent. This follow-up included the informed consent document, the survey in a Word document, the document detailing the guidelines and strategies, and the QuestionPro survey link.

Summary

This chapter has offered a detailed explanation of the steps taken to create and design guidelines for integrating care pedagogy into faculty development during emergency remote teaching. It also described the data collection process from existing literature using electronic databases like Education Research Complete, ERIC, and Scopus to execute the search strategies. The chapter then elaborated on the use of the Covidence program for reviewing abstracts and titles, full-text articles, and conducting data extraction. Care-informed themes aligned with Noddings' elements of caring were identified and highlighted. Each theme was supported by cited strategies from the literature, leading to the formulation of proposed guidelines based on these findings.

CHAPTER 5 EVALUATION AND REVISION

Introduction

This chapter gives an overview of the steps and procedures which were executed to create the guidelines and their associated strategies. It also provides details about the QuestionPro Survey, reviewers' recruitment invitations, and the responding expert reviewers. Finally, this chapter reports on the expert reviewers' perspectives, feedback, and suggestions to improve the design of the guidelines.

Research Overview

The development of this DDR study followed a structured five-step process. This included analyzing relevant literature to extract care-related themes, identifying and categorizing strategies supporting these themes, and creating guidelines that aligned with both the themes and strategies. The resulting themes, drawn from care pedagogy, faculty development, and emergency remote teaching literature, were organized under Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) four care elements: Modeling, Dialogue, Practice, and Confirmation. Themes identified under Modeling included aspects such as approachability and relatedness, instructor presence and availability, deliberate personalization, fostering interest and intrigue, adherence to the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), faculty readiness for online teaching, compassionate flexibility, accessibility, instructional scaffolding, immediacy and promptness, technical competence, institutional support, simplicity and cognitive load reduction, and self-care during times of crisis. The second element of care, Dialogue, encompassed themes such as personalization, timing/promptness, and immediacy, the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), open communication, approachability and relatedness, accessibility, rapport building, institutional support, instructional scaffolding, and instructor presence.

Practice, as the third element of care, included components such as peer mentoring, collaboration, and peer-to-peer support, as well as social presence and community building. The final

care element, Confirmation, incorporated personalization, pacing, and institutional support. Additional details can be found in the tables in Chapter Four, pp.57-64.

QuestionPro Survey and Respondents

The process of crafting the survey instrument was grounded in rigorous research methodology. Survey questions were developed to closely align with the care-informed themes and corresponding strategies. Initially, the questions were organized in a MS Word document and structured according to the four key care models: Modeling, Dialogue, Practice, and Confirmation. The survey itself was divided into five sections: Introduction, Consent Statement, Demographic Information (Reviewer Profiles), Noddings' care model elements: Modeling, Dialogue, Confirmation, and Practice (with accompanying descriptions), and the Survey Conclusion.

The questionnaire was refined through an iterative design process to achieve its final form. Once finalized, the questions were transferred to the QuestionPro platform for implementation. The survey incorporated all thirty proposed guidelines and their 136 accompanying strategies to ensure ease of access and convenience for participants (expert reviewers).

Upon receiving the IRB approval letter #24-250, a recruitment letter was prepared and distributed along with the documents to eleven expert reviewers in an initial invitation email. Upon receiving confirmation from nine reviewers about their willingness to participate, a follow-up email was sent. It included the informed consent document, the survey in a MS Word document, a document outlining the guidelines and strategies, and the QuestionPro survey link.

The participants serving as expert reviewers were granted two weeks to complete the survey. The first expert reviewer responses were received within the first week of sending out the invitation on May 06, 2024. The rest of the participants promised to respond within the two weeks, and some needed

an extension to complete it. As promised in the email invitation, a gentle reminder was sent to all participants to remind them about the deadline for completing the QuestionPro survey. After the reminder, more responses were submitted. The total number of responses received as of August 17 was 8 (88.9%) out of 9 participants. Therefore, the data collection period was approximately four months. Of the eleven identified expert reviewers, there was one decline (rejected the review invitation), one withdrawal (started but did not complete the survey), and one non-response. The time that the expert reviewers took to complete the QuestionPro survey varied between a maximum of 123.5 minutes and a minimum of 13.9 minutes. There was variety in the responses provided by the expert reviewers. The next section outlines the expert reviewers' profiles, as well as some individual details about expert reviewers who granted permission for their identities to be revealed.

Expert Reviewer Profiles

Eight expert reviewers participated in the research study: five males and three females. Their highest educational qualification was a doctoral degree. In addition, three reviewers had over 20 years of experience in education and online teaching, four had between 15 and 20 years of experience, and one reviewer had 10 to 15 years of experience. The following section outlines the profiles of the expert reviewers who chose to disclose their identities. Expert reviewer profiles were obtained from publicly available sources, including LinkedIn profiles and the official websites of their affiliated universities.

Dr. Ane Turner Johnson is a Professor in Educational Leadership, Administration, and Research. She received her Ph.D. from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in 2009, majoring in Higher Education Administration and International Research and Development. She is an international education researcher with a focus on African countries such as Ghana, Kenya, the Gambia, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, Zanzibar, and Zimbabwe. Dr. Johnson's research interests include policymaking, governance in higher education, academics and administrators in African higher education, and qualitative research methods.

Dr. Keith Heggart is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Technology Sydney, Australia. He is also the Director of the Center for Research on Education in a Digital Society. Dr. Heggart possesses extensive experience across various educational contexts serving as an academic, practitioner, and policymaker. Additionally, Dr. Heggart has a strong background in collaborating with colleagues, networking with teams, managing projects and teams, and engaging in strategic planning.

Dr. Miguel (Miko) Nino is an expert in instructional design, adult education, and online learning. He received his Ph.D. in instructional design and technology from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He previously worked as the Director of Online Learning at the University of North Carolina Pembroke, and is currently the Assistant Vice President for Adult and Online Education at Rhode Island College. He teaches courses in topics such as digital learning and digital literacy and e-portfolios to undergraduate and graduate students.

Dr. Peter Doolittle is a professor of educational psychology in the School of Education at Virginia Tech. Dr. Doolittle has held positions such as Assistant Provost for Teaching and Learning, Director of the Center for Instructional development and Educational Research (CIDER), and Director of the School of Education (SOE). Dr. Doolittle also holds 30 years of teaching experience with undergraduate and graduate students using different formats in conventional, online, and blended learning. His current research focuses on theoretical foundations, practical implications for active learning in the college classroom, and the influence of working memory capacity on college student learning in digital spaces.

Dr. Samantha Blevins currently works for Radford University as an Instructional Designer and Learning Architect. Her work interests focus on the use and implementation of e- portfolios across campus. She received her Ph.D. in Instructional Design and Technology from Virginia Tech in 2013. She has also received Quality Matters (QM) certifications both as a peer reviewer and as a face-to-face facilitator in 2014.

Dr. Xie Pearl received her Ph.D. from Kansas University in special education, instructional design,

technology, and innovation. She is the Director of Universal Design for Learning and Accessible Services in TLOS (Technology enhanced learning and online strategies) at Virginia Tech. She recently received a Dissertation Research Award from Emily Tylor Center for Women and Gender Equity at Kansas University.

Reviewers Seven and Eight chose not to disclose their identities. It is worth mentioning here that to maintain confidentiality, each reviewer was assigned a designated number (e.g., Reviewer One, Reviewer Two, and so on) to ensure that their input was not associated with their identities.

Expert Reviewers' Evaluation

The subsequent section details the expert reviewers' responses to the survey questions and feedback on the effectiveness of the guidelines offered. The themes (T) are discussed in the same order and fashion presented in the survey. They highlight Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) four care elements of Modeling, Dialogue, Practice, and Confirmation. Specifically, Modeling contains fourteen different themes, Dialogue holds ten themes, Practice covers three themes, and Confirmation is comprised of three themes. Thus, 30 total themes were identified and are discussed below.

Reviewers' Feedback on Modeling

This section outlines the reviewers' evaluations for the first care element: Modeling. This element is comprised of fourteen main themes (T): T.I.1 approachability & relatedness, T.I.2 instructor presence & availability, T.I.3 deliberate personalization, T.I.4 fostering interest & intrigue, T.I.5 adherence to the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), T.I.6 faculty readiness for online teaching, T.I.7 compassionate flexibility, T.I.8 accessibility, T.I.9 instructional scaffolding, T.I.10 immediacy & promptness, T.I.11 technical competence, T.I.12 institutional support, T.I.13 simplicity & cognitive load reduction, & T.I.14 self-care during times of crisis.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.1: Approachability and Relatedness

When reviewers were asked about the effectiveness of the guidelines associated with this

theme, six reviewers gave affirmative responses about its efficiency. Most reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, R7, & R8) recognized the value and significance of being approachable and relatable to learners in an online space. The reviewers also stressed the significance of rapport building with students to support and enhance their learning. For example, Reviewer One commented, "I believe this is effective. These factors are concrete strategies for building rapport with students." Reviewer Three said, "Yes, I do. Faculty should absolutely be doing these things." In addition, Reviewer Four praised the rationale and research-informed literature support.

Reviewer Four praised the guideline, describing it as, "logical and evidenced in research." Reviewer Seven wrote, "They provide examples of how faculty can be approachable and relatable." Reviewer Eight appreciated the variability and diversity of ideas and stated, "These are different ideas, but all of them contribute to the learner's success."

Although the six reviewers appreciated the effectiveness of the guideline, a few of them expressed some concerns related to its applicability and practicality. For example, Reviewer Three mentioned the challenge of being caring in the educational setting, especially with an already overwhelmed and busy faculty. Reviewer Three commented, "Care is tricky, I think, at times though, when a faculty member has their own struggles." Reviewer Five raised a concern about the relevance (connection to synchronous learning) of this guideline. He argued that faculty approachability and relatedness cannot be restricted to synchronous learning formats only. This could be achieved via asynchronous learning modalities through storytelling, roleplaying, and avatars. Clarity issues were another limitation expressed by the reviewers, especially Reviewers Six and Seven. Reviewer Six raised the concern that the strategies were vague and ambiguous by saying, "It seems the strategies are not explicit and clear." This indicates the need for the strategies to be refined and improved. Additionally, Reviewer Seven criticized the strategy: S.I.1.b about "offering multiplicity" to be "confusing." They questioned the meaning and inquired, "Does it mean offer multiple ways for students to contact you?"

Reviewer Seven also questioned the correctness of this phrase in English. This observation suggests a need for clear definitions and more specific strategies. Applicability concerns were another limitation. Reviewer Three believed that the application of these strategies by contingent or part-time faculty raised some concerns related to faculty workload. According to Reviewer Three, it could be challenging for part timers to be available in “many different ways.”

To address the feedback provided by the reviewers and ensure the guideline achieves its intended goals, some recommendations should be considered to improve its design. When asked about their overall suggestions to improve the guideline, Reviewer Two suggested reducing the number of categories and strategies, “These categories and strategies are excellent, there's just a lot of them :-p.” Reviewer Seven also mentioned this, “I don't know what is supposed to be in the Modeling guidelines. It seems fine to me.” Another consideration could be to combine similar strategies to reduce redundancy and minimize volume. Another potential strategy could be to broaden the perspective of the guideline, and make it more inclusive for all types of faculty (full-time vs. contingent).

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.I.2: Presence and Availability

Most of the reviewers with the exception of Reviewer Five (R1, R2, R3, R4, R6, R 7, & R8) appreciated this guideline and its strategies, and believed in its usefulness and effectiveness in enhancing online learners’ motivation and engagement. The general endorsement of the guidelines was manifested in many responses. For example, Reviewer Four recognized that these strategies were reasonable, and documented and supported by literature practices.

Reviewer Six also appreciated that the techniques offered were practical and doable by asserting that, “those strategies seem specific, actionable and manageable for an instructor.” Reviewer Eight valued that the strategies were applicable in different modalities by noting this, “they appear to work in different modalities, but all help the learner.”

Although seven reviewers supported the effectiveness of the guideline, a few reviewers

expressed some concerns related to applying its strategies. Some reviewers emphasized the need for having clear and specific contact information for students to reach out. For instance, Reviewer One suggested humanizing the guideline and singled out the necessity for having a real contact person rather than, “a generic email address.” Reviewer Three critiqued the guideline and mentioned there were practical considerations that needed to be taken care of, such as the challenges that part-time faculty encounter with workload and availability, and the possibility of a large magnitude disaster. Reviewer Three noted, “I will reiterate that some of this is only applicable to full-time faculty. If there is a larger crisis, availability and accessibility may be challenged.” Reviewer Five did not see the guideline as effective, and thought that the instructor should be available on a regular basis for learners. Reviewer Five discussed the need for having a clear and regular means of contact instead of just being “on demand.” Reviewer Seven expressed a concern about the existence of an overlap between this guideline of presence and availability and the other previously mentioned guideline for being approachable. It is worth mentioning here that there is a difference in meaning between being present and available and being approachable and relatable. Presence and availability practices are exhibited through email interactions, online office hours, or video conferences (Jones, 2021). Approachability and relatedness on the other hand, are manifested via friendly behaviors (e.g., learning students’ names, smiling at them, greeting them and asking them how they are doing), according to Jones (2021).

To address the concerns and observations shared by the reviewers and ensure the guideline meets its intended objective, there are some suggestions that need to be considered to enhance this guideline. One consideration could be personalizing contact information and making learners feel they are communicating with a real person/human being, rather than an email address. The guideline could be further improved by addressing Reviewer Five’s concern by clarifying the term “when needed” and making it more specific and explicit (e.g., on a regular basis, weekly, at specified office hours, or by appointment). Attention could be paid to the different roles that faculty play in the online learning

environment (full time faculty vs. part time) by making flexible guideline strategies that fit all roles and course modalities (online vs. hybrid or blended learning).

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.3: Deliberate Personalization

Most reviewers (6 out of 8) responded “Yes” when asked about this guideline, affirming its effectiveness and benefits in online contexts. Reviewers Four, Five, and Eight strongly appreciated the guideline. Reviewer Four wrote that the guideline was, “Logical and evidenced in research.” Reviewer Five appreciated the qualities of social presence and engagement for online education. Reviewer Five believed that practicing social presence among students in an online setting fostered learners’ motivation and engagement. They also stated that the strategies, “help in the development of social presence, which is highly needed in online courses.” Reviewer Eight recognized the different notions offered in the strategies and believed they all enhanced students’ success and learning. Reviewer Eight stated that they were, “different ideas, but they help” the learners in the online environment.

Although this guideline was broadly supported, the reviewers shared some concerns and limitations. For example, Reviewer One praised the guideline’s value, but thought that online educators needed to practice caution when implementing personalization. Reviewer One also believed that online instructors need to strike a balance between practicing personal connection and professionalism saying, “The guidelines above are good, but educators need to be able to navigate this carefully - i.e. not being too familiar or too personal or revealing too much.” Reviewer One also asserted, “Be friendly, but not their friend when talking about students.” This is a finding that has been echoed by Moorhouse and Tiet (2021). In their study,

Moorhouse and Tiet (2021) asserted that trying to exhibit care in an online context by sharing personal selves can give both faculty and learners “a sense of vulnerability” (p.220), which should be consciously and proactively avoided when planning to embrace a culture of care in an online setting. Reviewers Three and Six thought that implementing these personalized strategies could pose a

challenge for some specific courses such as research methods and for some specific contexts like crisis situations. There was recognition among the two reviewers that these strategies needed to be more flexible and adaptable across content and contexts.

Reviewer Three stated, “Yes, mostly. I predominantly teach research methods and personal-level learning (S.I.3.c and d) can be challenging.” While Reviewer Six mentioned, “This set of strategies would work in normal situation. Regarding emergent situation, it seems more flexible and personalized strategies needed.” Although Reviewer Five appreciated this guideline, they called for granting students autonomy and letting them have control over how much they wanted to share and contribute commenting, “However, students should have the opportunity to choose how much they want to share or participate in activities that might be dealing with personal details.”

To address the reviewers’ concerns and ensure the guideline meets its intended outcomes, some potential strategies need to be introduced to improve this guideline design in the future. Reviewer Seven called to make the guideline clearer and more specific. Reviewer Seven also expressed the need to provide clearly defined definitions for some terms such as “reciprocal care” and “personal networks.” Additionally, they also thought that the strategies needed to be clearly divided up and broken down into smaller parts. The guideline could be designed to offer more flexibility on personalized strategies for faculty in the online space and emergency teaching contexts. Another potential improvement could be to give students more autonomy and agency over their preferences and how much they want to reveal and contribute.

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.I.4: Creating Interest and Intrigue

There was consensus among seven reviewers on the effectiveness of this guideline. Most reviewers (7 out of 8) agreed on the value of creating interesting lesson plans to engage students, motivate them, and boost their learning. For instance, Reviewer Four praised the guideline and described it as reasonable and informed by literature. Reviewer Five mentioned

that this guideline was, “effective because engaging content triggers interest in students.”

Although the seven reviewers appreciated the effectiveness of the guideline, most of them expressed some concerns related to applying its strategies. For instance, Reviewer One believed that this strategy was challenging. Reviewer One noted that it required a deep understanding of students’ needs and interests. In addition, Reviewer One commented that it demanded careful and thoughtful lesson planning commenting, “It is not as simple as it sounds though - it requires an understanding of what students are interested in, for a start.” Reviewer Three shared the perspective that this guideline brought about a context sensitivity challenge. There was an acknowledgement that the effectiveness of this guideline can vary depending on the students’ demographics. Reviewer Three noted that applying this guideline was context sensitive because, as a teacher of graduate students, they felt that graduate students focused more on efficiency and content rather than engaging lesson plans. Reviewer Three asserted, “If you are a graduate instructor, like myself, this can be challenging as they are adults and are focused on getting in and getting out, not on being entertained necessarily.” Reviewer Six raised a clarity issue. Reviewer Six discussed the fact that this guideline was not clear and specific to her. It was rather vague and lacked clarity stating, “This strategy does not seem specific to me, and it would be challenging to implement this strategy.”

To address the reviewers’ concerns and ensure the guideline achieves its intended objectives, it will be necessary to introduce certain strategies to enhance its design in future revisions. To respond to the concerns of Reviewer Five and Eight, some changes could be added to the terminology and scope of this guideline. For example, this guideline could be worded differently by saying “apply creativity” rather than “be creative” as suggested by Reviewer Five. Another consideration could be avoiding the age-specific terms such as “young” and making this guideline applicable to all students’ levels as proposed by Reviewer Eight.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.5: JEDI (Justice, Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion) Framework

All eight reviewers agreed that the guideline and its proposed strategies were effective and beneficial for incorporation into the emergency remote teaching (ERT) context. To illustrate examples, Reviewer One stated that all the strategies “make sense.” Reviewer Two praised the strategies and mentioned that the 19 strategies were “all excellent.” Additionally, Reviewer 3 said “I love all of this” and Reviewer Eight described them as “all good ideas.” The guideline and its strategies have also been praised by Reviewer Four who asserted that they were “logical and evidenced in research.” Reviewers Five and Six appreciated the promotion of the JEDI framework in the strategies. They believed that there was a severe need for them during emergency remote teaching (ERT). To give an example, Reviewer Five stated that, “the JEDI framework can promote an inclusive environment extremely needed during ERT.” Reviewer Six also commented by saying, “the strategies seem to build inclusive and accessible learning environment.” Reviewers Two, Seven, and Eight appreciated the diversity of the strategies offered. This perspective of promoting diversity of strategies to meet students’ needs has been discussed by Bunger (2021), Karakaya (2021) and Bozkurt et al. (2020) in online education settings.

Despite the praise and support this guideline garnered, it was received with some issues and concerns. One concern was shared by Reviewer Two when he raised the issue of categorizing and sorting out these strategies as a challenging task. They said, “sorting the strategies into these categories will never be perfect.” Reviewers Two and Seven raised some concerns related to the vagueness and ambiguity of some terminologies in the suggested strategies. For instance, Reviewer Two mentioned that, “some of the terminology may not be clear to everyone, especially those who are not fluent in DEI.” Reviewer Seven stated that “S.I.5.a is pretty vague.” This strategy is related to cultural knowledge and competencies.

Although this strategy has been defined, clarified, and supported with some citations from the literature (FEMA, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020; Mehta & Aguilera, 2020), Reviewer Seven thought it was

unclear. In addition, Reviewer Two thought that some strategies suggested along with the guideline were irrelevant to the JEDI framework. This Reviewer also questioned if the strategies aligned well with the JEDI values. For example, Reviewer Two argued that emotional intelligence did not belong to the JEDI framework by stating, “regarding S.I.5.j, emotional intelligence isn't really JEDI, it's more of a personality/prior knowledge variable.” In fact, emotional intelligence is a critical and valuable component of JEDI values. Through this intelligence, faculty can show empathy, social justice, support, and understanding for students’ diverse backgrounds and cultural differences as confirmed in the scholarly literature by Dang and Zhang (2021), Green et al. (2020), Jones (2021), Karakaya (2021), and Mehta & Aguilera (2020). In addition, Reviewer Two had a different perspective about technology/gender differences. He believed these areas did not belong to the JEDI framework but to differences pertinent to gender, ability, and age. He stated, “S.I.5.m, S.I.5.n, and S.I.5.q seems to belong to a more general strategy of being aware of technology related differentiated needs, which may involve gender, ability, or age related differences.” Previous literature reported that aspects such as gender, ability, age, race, culture, and religion are integral parts of the JEDI framework (FEMA, 2019; Knox & Haupt, 2020; Mehta & Aguilera, 2020). Reviewer Two believed that there was redundancy in the proposed strategies. He stated that, “there's a lot of repetition within the strategies.” However, all the reviewers were notified that there would be some recurring themes among the guidelines. Reviewer Three noted that there were some potential hurdles in implementing JEDI framework-related strategies, especially with some aspects related to “personal level pedagogy” (personalization), cultural considerations, and gender biases. The same reviewer asserted that, “this type of personal level pedagogy is extremely difficult. I also don't think it's faculty's job to serve as a student caretaker or therapist.” Reviewer Three also expressed a concern about the implementation of this guideline with big classes or with faculty who have heavy workloads. Reviewer 3 commented, “I mean I love all this, but I think we should be thoughtful about folx who teach a class of 100 students or teach a 4-4 load...” There

also was recognition among some Reviewers (Two and Eight) that the strategies needed to be reduced in volume and size.

To address the reviewers' concerns and ensure the guideline meets its intended outcomes, it will be important to incorporate specific strategies to improve its design in future revisions. One consideration could be to design the guideline to be simpler, more specific and clearer. Another consideration could be to remove the ambiguity in the guideline and provide faculty with clear definitions about some technical terms such as DEI: Diversity, Equity, and inclusion. More concrete examples can be provided to demonstrate their meaning and how they can be implemented. To respond to the faculty workload concern, the guideline could be designed with differentiating strategies for faculty with varying workloads and responsibilities. To address the volume concern, the strategies could be reduced to eliminate redundancy and overlap, minimizing the number of strategies for faculty convenience.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.6: Faculty's Readiness to Teach Online

Half of the reviewers (R1, R2, R3, and R4) supported the idea that faculty readiness was crucial for successful online teaching context. For example, Reviewer One endorsed the effectiveness of the guideline and noted that teaching in an online setting requires preparation, adjustment, and a unique set of skills that are different from in-person teaching. They commented, "Yes. I agree with this one. I think that online teaching and learning is similar to face to face, but different enough that it requires some adaptation or new skill development." Reviewer Four praised the guideline and described it as "Logical and evidenced in research."

Reviewers Two and Three supported the guideline but with some reservations. They expressed some concerns. For instance, Reviewer Two raised the issue of confusion and lack of clarity in the guideline and its proposed strategy. Reviewer Two felt that the guideline centered on convincing students about faculty credentials and qualifications rather than enhancing and strengthening their

readiness, skills, and preparation to teach online saying, “This strategy just seems odd... it seems more related to convincing students that the faculty member is qualified to teach online, rather than establishing fostering faculty members readiness to teach online.” Reviewer Three appreciated the guideline and discussed the challenges that some online faculty faced at institutions related to getting the support and training they needed before starting their online teaching careers. They noted,

Lord yes. The mentality is typically, just throw us in and we'll figure it out. There should definitely be some assessment of this prior to having faculty teach in these environments and know how to create a positive online culture. I sure didn't at first. It took me years to figure this out on my own.

Reviewers Five, Six, Seven, and Eight did not see the guideline as effective. Reviewer Five criticized the guideline and believed that it might be confusing because it conflates online teaching with emergency remote teaching (ERT). They stated,

Many faculty and instructors are not ready to teach online or remotely during emergencies. However, online teaching is not the same as emergency remote teaching. I wonder if this guideline can create confusion and it should be renamed to focus on ERT.

Reviewer Six raised the issue that the strategy accompanying the guideline was “not specific enough and not actionable,” recommending more specificity and concrete examples. Reviewer Seven questioned and wondered about the meaning and purpose of the guideline and what it meant commenting, “I don't understand what it means. I think it means that someone somehow needs to help students become ready to teach.” Reviewer Eight’s comment suggested that the guideline implied that there was too much focus on the faculty and their credentials and qualifications rather than their skills and practical ability to teach effectively in an online format. They wrote, “I don't think bragging about expertise is key.”

To address the reviewers’ comments and ensure the guideline meets its purpose, there are

some potential strategies that should be implemented to elevate the guideline quality. One possible consideration could be to clarify the distinction in terminology between normal planned online education and emergency remote teaching. Another consideration could be to make the guideline more concrete by offering training opportunities and support for online instructors in the form of professional development and training sessions. Another possible improvement could be to rephrase the guideline to clearly focus on practical skills and ability rather than qualifications and credentials.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.7: Compassionate Flexibility

Most reviewers (six out of eight) agreed with the core idea of the guideline and supported the effectiveness of compassion and flexibility in the ERT setting. Some reviewers (R1, R4, R5, R6, & R8) strongly supported the guideline's promotion of compassionate flexibility in online delivery. For example, Reviewer One affirmed the guideline and emphasized the need to treat learners as humans. Reviewer One noted, "I try to remind faculty to think about the learners as humans first, students second. This means being flexible and recognizing that the learning environment is only one small part of their lives." Reviewer Four described the guideline as reasonable and literature informed. Reviewer Five praised the strategies saying, "These guidelines promote a flexible and understanding environment needed during ERT." Reviewer Six stated that the guideline would be good "to build flexibility in online delivery and teaching practices with actionable items."

Some reviewers gave conditional agreements, whereas others strongly supported it. One issue shared by Reviewer Two was regarding an overlap and redundancy mentioned in another different category. They noted, "there is a lot here that overlap or may belong in a difference category. For example, the second strategy (due date flexibility) seems to be a specific form of the first strategy (removing time pressures)." Reviewer Two also raised a clarity, suggesting that certain strategies needed more clarification. Reviewer Two wrote,

There also seems to be a need for a little bit more explanation related to what certain strategies mean. For example, what does 'Connecting a course with other content across disciplines' mean? How does this related to flexibility? Is this having the same assignment count for more than one class? Why is 'Showing students different roles and career opportunities pertinent to the course content and discipline' or 'Offering emotional support and asking students how they are doing' under flexibility?

Additionally, Reviewer Two criticized the guideline and felt that the strategy related to reducing the workload might not be supported and appreciated by some instructors, saying,

Some of these strategies are also likely to be not supported [b]y a lot of faculty, for example, 'Being flexible and considerate to students by reducing the workload.' While compassion is good, a calculus I teacher is likely to say that students need to reach point X in the contact in order to be prepared for calculus II.

Reviewer Two also shared that, "In a more general sense, any strategy that relates to content needs to be very carefully written." Reviewer Three critiqued the guideline and the challenge of its utility in "an accelerated program," indicating there was no room for flexibility.

Reviewer Three mentioned, "If you teach in an accelerated program, you absolutely don't have time and space for many of these (those related to submission deadlines)." Reviewer Three also disagreed with the notion that effort should be included as part of grading criteria stating, "Also, effort isn't a grading criteria. That's ridiculous in my estimation." However, Reviewer Three believed that faculty should adapt and adjust in the wake of crisis commenting, "On the other hand, faculty should absolutely adapt in the face of crisis and assess students in different ways. Leaving an entire grade to an exam or a summative assessment is bad teaching, in my estimation."

To address the reviewers' concerns and ensure the guideline meets its intended outcomes, some strategies should be applied to improve this guideline. One consideration could be simplifying the

guideline by making it more explicit with clear definitions of terms. Another consideration could be differentiating between strategies for faculty working on accelerated course formats and normal online course layouts. To address the volume concern, the strategies could be combined and reduced.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.8: Accessibility

When asked about the effectiveness of this guideline, six reviewers out of eight supported and appreciated it, believing in its importance to enhance online teaching and learning. Reviewer Four, for example, affirmed the guideline and described it as logical and research based. Reviewer Five strongly supported advocacy for accessibility, and believed that all instructors should prioritize it noting, "However, faculty should advocate for accessibility all the time. Accessibility is never optional." Reviewer Eight liked the guideline and stated that it contained "good ideas."

Despite the praise this guideline received, some reviewers accepted it with some reservations. Reviewers One and Two appreciated the guideline, but felt it lacked specific techniques for learners with disabilities. They noted a mismatch between the guideline's scope and the traditional understanding of accessibility. Reviewer Two noted redundancy and overlap in some strategies (sub-guidelines) such as S.I.8.e and S.I.8.g, commenting, "S.I.8.e and S.I.8.g are the same." Reviewer Three also accepted the guideline with some reservations. They questioned the utility of recording synchronous sessions due to their non-mandatory nature and potential learner discomfort stating, "These make absolute sense. I'm a little on the fence about recording synchronous sessions for a couple of reasons: 1. mine are not required; 2. recording may prevent other learners from putting themselves out there." Reviewer Six and Seven did not see the guideline as effective. Reviewer Six critiqued the guideline based on the focus of "access" over digital accessibility and inclusive pedagogy practices, saying, "The accessibility strategies primarily focus on access instead of digital accessibility practices and inclusive pedagogy." Reviewer Seven also noted some confusion in the guideline language, mentioning, "I don't understand who they are advocating for. I think the wording may be confusing me." Reviewer Seven suggested a reframing of

the guideline to, “Faculty should make course materials accessible. Is that what is intended?”

To address the reviewers' concerns and align the guideline with its intended outcomes, implementing potential strategies for improvement is advised. One recommendation could be to clarify the scope of the guideline and the target audience to align them with broader accessibility goals. Germane to this, one potential consideration could be to make the strategies more explicit and specific. For instance, this strategy “S.I.8.b: Applying accessibility policies to accommodate students’ needs (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021)” in its current format includes accessibility compliance but may be unclear. Another approach could be to address redundancy and refine strategies. This could be done by merging strategy S.I.8.c: “S.I.8.c: Being more accessible by using Slack or Zoom office hours (Gelles et al., 2020)” and strategy S.I.8.g: “Providing access to tutorials on advanced features of some widely used platforms Zoom, WebEX, Skype, and Google Meet) (Barr et al., 2021, p.11).” Another potential recommendation could be to broaden the perspective of the guideline and make it incorporate digital accessibility and inclusive teaching pedagogy that aligns with modern accessibility standards (Reviewer Six’s concern).

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.I.9: Instructional Scaffolding

Most reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, & R8) found the guideline to be effective for supporting learners in the ERT space. Reviewers One, Four, Five, and Eight completely endorsed the guideline in its current format without any concerns. For example, Reviewer One described the strategies as comprehensive saying, “I think these cover the main points.” Reviewer Four described them as logical and appreciated the guideline’s foundation in research. Reviewer Five highlighted the importance of scaffolding in supporting students' success by underscoring its value not only in normal circumstances but especially in the ERT setting. They stated, “Scaffolding is an effective instructional strategy, so it would also be beneficial for students in ERT settings.” Reviewer Eight affirmed the importance of this scaffolding guideline and stated that it included “good ideas.”

While reviewers accepted the guideline, they did have some reservations. For instance,

Reviewer Two questioned the inclusion of some strategies and their relation to scaffolding: “S.I.9.a: Applying copyright law and fair use guidelines/directions when using copyrighted materials (Bolliger & Halupa, 2021)” and “S.I.9.b: Recognizing the distinctive challenge of online learning in applied courses or courses based on practice (Barr et al., 2021).” They noted, “The strategies are all good. It's unclear how S.I.9.a or b are related to scaffolding.” Reviewer Three accepted the guideline, but shared a concern about the last strategy: “S.I.9.f: Giving extra time, nurturing, scaffolding, and understanding learners’ comfort level with online collaboration (Robinson et al., 2017).” Reviewer Three highlighted the need to adapt scaffolding approaches to fit different learners’ demographics and contexts such as adult learners in accelerated programs commenting, “Except for the last one. Again, I work with adults, and they chose an accelerated online program for convenience, so they have to figure it out quickly. I think it's the institution's responsibility to get them comfortable, not mine.” Reviewers Six and Seven did not see the effectiveness of this guideline. Reviewer Six criticized the narrow focus on scaffolding offered in the strategies. Reviewer Six recommended it include practices like, “dialogue, feedback, and shared responsibility in designing learning assignments, assessments, and activities.” Reviewer Seven had a similar concern to Reviewer Two about the inclusion of some strategies and their relation to scaffolding noting, “It is not clear how this guideline is related to 9.a. I think that it does relate to several of the other strategies.”

To address the reviewers' concerns and align the guideline with its intended objectives, specific strategies are recommended. One potential strategy could be to clarify the scope of scaffolding and its definition. This could be done by broadening the perspective of the instructional scaffolding concept to include practices like, “dialogue, feedback, and shared responsibility in designing learning assignments, assessments, and activities” as suggested by Reviewer Six. This guideline could also be enhanced by offering rationale and justification for why some strategies are included under instructional scaffolding and how they help learners in the ERT setting. Another consideration could be to address diverse

learners' needs, demographics and contexts (e.g., adult learners vs. non adult and normal online courses vs. accelerated programs).

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.10: Immediacy and Promptness

Seven reviewers (with the exception of Reviewer 7) agreed with the guideline and supported the importance of faculty promptness in responding to students and meeting their needs in online environments including ERT. Reviewers One, Three, Four, Five, and Eight completely endorsed the guideline core idea without any reservations or concerns. For example, Reviewer One believed that immediacy and promptness were crucial qualities in modern online teaching to help students continue the flow of their learning without any delays, noting, "Yes! Students often ask for help when they need it - so prompt responses are vital because it means the student can continue with their learning at that time - not having to wait a couple of days." Reviewer Three also appreciated this guideline and mentioned, "I can not agree with these more." Reviewer Three affirmed the value of this guideline and considered it a great teaching and communication tool that should not be underestimated, stating, "It's funny how so many of my colleagues though take a laissez faire approach to communication. It's another teaching/learning tool that they waste." Reviewer Four liked the guideline and described it as informed by logical research. Reviewers Five and Eight described giving punctual feedback and timely responses as essential to online delivery, including emergency remote teaching. Reviewer Five wrote, "Providing timely feedback and responding on a timely fashion are must in online instruction and ERT."

Despite the praise and appreciation this guideline received, it also raised some criticism and concerns. For example, Reviewer Two supported the guideline but thought that the second strategy was simply a specific version of the first one. He also believed that some strategies related to other mentioned themes such as "presence" or "personalization." Although Reviewer Three strongly advocated for this guideline, they called for a balance between being highly responsive and practicing healthy approaches in responding to learners' needs, commenting, "But I do think that being

immediately available (which is how I am) is also not a very healthy approach to work/life balance.”

Similarly, Reviewer Six shared an observation about the importance of achieving a middle ground between immediate availability and burnout saying, “It is important for instructors to be responsive in a timely manner, but also demonstrate it in health and professional manner as good role models to take care of their own well-beings.” Reviewer Six also thought that there should be clear communication of expectations about immediate feedback and responsiveness at the beginning of the course, noting, “The ground communication rules and expectations should be communicated and implemented through the semester.” Reviewer One was the only reviewer who did not see the guideline as effective, referring to an overlap and redundancy in the guidelines.

To address the reviewers' feedback and ensure the guideline aligns with its intended objectives, several strategies are recommended. One potential strategy could be to address the balance issue by training faculty to communicate clear expectations about responsiveness and giving feedback at the beginning of the semester. Another consideration could be involving institutions to stipulate standardized policies on response times (e.g., 24-48 hours) to create consistency and regularity.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.11: Technical Competence

This guideline was widely accepted by most of the reviewers (R1, R2, R4, R5, R6, R7, & R8). They believed in its critical role for online courses, especially during emergency remote teaching. Reviewer One, for example, supported the guideline and praised its initiative in helping students tackle technical challenges. Reviewer One wrote, “Students like feeling like they're not 'lost' in online courses. These ideas help with that.” Reviewer Two appreciated the guideline and thought it was more related to Universal Design of Learning (UDL). He also questioned how UDL framework and caring intersect with technical competence commenting, “Some of the strategies relate to UDL recommendations. How are UDL and caring related?”

Reviewers Four, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight all supported the guideline and affirmed its value to

enhancing care through faculty technical competence. Reviewer One praised the guideline as reasonable and literature supported. Reviewer Five emphasized the importance of professional development, training, and ongoing support to keep up with technology advancement saying, “I would add that faculty should ensure that they have sound professional development to obtain relevant and current technical competence.” Like Reviewer One, Reviewer Six affirmed the importance of this guideline for faculty to be well-prepared to manage technical issues in online courses stating, “These strategies are important for faculty to demonstrate technical competence to handle all technical challenges and issues that might face students.” Reviewers Seven and Eight liked the guideline, stating that it contained good, helpful ideas.

Reviewer Three was the only one who did not support the guideline, stating that it was the institution’s responsibility to provide technical support, not faculty. Reviewer Three commented, “This is the university's responsibility. If they admit a student to an online program, then they should provide these resources.” They went on to say, “I have learning objectives that I have to get through in 6-8 weeks with adult students.”

To address the concerns raised by Reviewers Two and Three and ensure the guideline meets its intended purpose, several considerations should be factored into future guideline revisions. One key consideration could be to make the guideline more explicit and clearer, especially by explaining to instructors that UDL competency, along with being flexible and accessible, are essential caring qualities that all online instructors should possess. Another strategy could be to ensure that faculty receive ongoing professional development to build technical competence through continuous training and support. This will help faculty feel confident and proficient when managing any technical issues that may arise with students in their online courses.

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.I.12: Institutional Support

Most of the reviewers (6 out of 8) agreed on and appreciated the effectiveness of the guideline.

The reviewers cited different reasons for believing why the guideline was effective. Reviewers Three, Four, and Eight provided a “Yes” in their responses, along with reasons such as alignment with research, good and helpful strategies, and overall endorsement of the guideline’s value. Other reviewers accepted the guideline with some reservations. Reviewer One supported the guideline, but shared a concern related to time challenges in the course indicating, “Yes, I think so, but I think that this will be challenging due to time constraints. Ideally this needs to be within courses, not an optional extra.” Reviewer Two felt that topics such as self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and motivation were overly broad and challenging to teach in all disciplines commenting, “These strategies seem excessively broad and not the type of content or skills that should/could be delivered in most courses.” Reviewers Five and Seven did not see the guideline as effective. Reviewer Five questioned the connection between the proposed strategies and institutional support saying, “I don't see the connection between institutional support and the strategies. Are you referring to instructional and technical support?” Reviewer Seven felt that this guideline did not adequately fit this topic, referring to a prior guideline related to “technical skills.” They noted, “This does not cover 12.b. I think 12.b fits in the prior guideline about technical skills.”

To address the reviewers’ concerns and ensure the guideline meets its intended usage, some considerations can be incorporated into future guideline design. One strategy could be to narrow the scope and focus by requiring instructors to teach the above-mentioned topics (e.g., self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and motivation) in specific courses only. Regarding the previous consideration, these topics could be incorporated into the curriculum rather than being taught as add-on or extra elements. Another consideration could be to offer faculty clear guidance on institutional support and the different formats it takes (instructional, technical, or administrative). Another strategy could be to offer faculty professional development on unfamiliar topics such as self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and motivation, to help them become familiar with this content and better prepared to teach it in any

course.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.13: Simplicity and Cognitive Load Reduction

This guideline was widely accepted and appreciated by the majority of reviewers (R1 to R6). These reviewers cited the positive impact of reducing learners' cognitive load and enhancing learning outcomes. Reviewer One praised the guideline and said, "I especially like the notion of reducing the amount of assessment. I often think we over-assess." Reviewer Two also agreed and expressed, "These strategies are all good." When Reviewer Three was asked about the effectiveness of this guideline, they answered, "Yes, a thousand times." Reviewer Four described them as rational and backed up by research. Reviewer Five stated, "Yes!" Applying cognitivist strategies is certainly helpful to make sure learners master content.

Reviewer Six also appreciated the guideline, stating that it included, "Good and explicit strategies." Despite the praise this guideline obtained, it was received with some criticism from two reviewers (R7 & R8). For example, Reviewer Seven criticized the guideline's language saying, "The wording 'practice simplicity' is too vague. It makes it sound like the course should be easy." Although Reviewer Eight liked some of the guideline's ideas, they did not support the notion of reducing assignments commenting, "I like some of the ideas, but I don't feel it is necessary to drop assignments."

To respond to the reviewers' concerns and make sure the guideline achieves its intended purpose, some revisions should be considered for future iterations. One consideration could be refining the guideline terminology and clarifying the term "simplicity." Another consideration could be integrating contextual considerations for different course formats (accelerated programs vs. regular online courses). Another strategy could be guiding faculty towards striking a balance between workload (assessment) and academic rigor.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.I.14: Self-care During Times of Crisis

Almost all reviewers (R1 through R7) appreciated the guideline and shared a positive stance

toward it. Reviewer One for example, supported the core idea of the guideline and the importance of faculty self-care, but advised caution. They believed that this should not distract the faculty from their professional responsibility to care for and support their students commenting, “Yes, but I think we need to be careful that self-care doesn't replace the responsibility of the educator to exercise a duty of care for students.”

Similarly, Reviewer Two approached this guideline with slight discomfort and described the focus on faculty self-care as “weird,” signaling a conflict between self-care and professional duty. Reviewer Two wrote, “I agree with all of these strategies, but with most/all of the previous strategies focusing on the faculty demonstrating care for students, this seems weird that it's faculty self-care.” Reviewer Three completely supported the guideline and appreciated its principle, indicating that faculty who are advisors or supervisors should be mentally and emotionally present to meet the demands of their students and guide them in a mentorship or advising capacity. Reviewer Three mentioned, “Yes. Especially for those who you advise or supervise in some way. You can't let those folx drift - you have to be present for them.” Like Reviewer Three, Reviewer Four endorsed the guideline in its entirety and praised it as “Logical and evidenced in research.” Reviewers Five, Six, and Seven widely supported the guideline strategies and thought they effectively contributed to students' support and success, especially during emergency remote teaching. Reviewer Five said, “During ERT, there is a personal component that should be addressed. This ensures that students can experience success and support.” Although Reviewer Eight described the strategies as “good ideas,” they asserted, “but FERPA would restrict many outside of K-12 from talking to family.” This was expressed in disagreement with, “S.I.14.: Initiating contact with learners and their families.”

To address the reviewers' concerns and ensure the guideline meets its intended purpose, a future version could explain clearly that there should be a balance between faculty performing their professional duties and exercising self-care. To address Reviewer Five's criticism, the strategy “S.I.14.:

Initiating contact with learners and their families” could be removed.

Reviewers’ Feedback on Dialogue

This section outlines the reviewers’ evaluations for the second care element: Dialogue. This element is comprised of ten main themes (T): T.II.1 personalization, T.II.2 timing/promptness & immediacy, T.II.3 the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion), T.II.4 open communication, T.II.5 approachability & relatedness, T.II.6 accessibility, T.II.7 rapport building, T.II.8 institutional support, T.II.9 instructional scaffolding, and T.II.10 instructor presence.

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.II.1: Personalization

Five reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, & R8) expressed consensus on the effectiveness of this guideline and its importance in enhancing connection and community in online environments. For instance, Reviewer One shared an observation about his students’ preference for having one-on-one interactions in the online learning space. Reviewer One noted, “I often find that students have a preference for 1:1.” Reviewer Two also appreciated most of the strategies and commented, “most of the strategies are good.” In addition, Reviewer Three thought that personalized interaction was essential, stating that, “Yes, I think one on one is so important in the online environment.” Reviewer Three also elaborated further, adding that this personalization approach was crucial not only for faculty, but for other individuals such as, “ineffective LMS managers/instructional designers who think that the online course modules and assignments are the only way to account for time in the course.” Reviewers Four and Eight described this guideline as “Logical and evidenced in research” and as containing “Good ideas.”

Although the reviewers praised the effectiveness of this guideline in fostering personalized connections in the online space, they expressed some concerns and limitations about aspects related to the execution of the strategies, personalization vs. privacy, categorization and ambiguity in definitions, contradictions between some proposed strategies, and a lack of humanization elements. For instance, Reviewer One noted a concern about the difficult implementation of these strategies with larger classes

despite the necessity for personalized connection. They stated, “I thin[k] this is important, but can be challenging with very large class sizes.” Another concern was shared by Reviewer Two regarding the personalization vs. privacy issue. They discussed the issue of camera use with students as having “two viable sides,” positive and negative. Specifically, “the first side, having cameras 'on' provides greater social interaction and presence for students” and, “the second side, having cameras 'on' can violate students privacy and create issues for students who do not have Home environments they wish to share with others.” Additionally, Reviewer Two raised the issue of confusion in the elements for the strategies stating, “the category for this element, is similar to the previous 'deliberate personalization' element. This may get confusing.” Reviewer Six also suggested adding “humanization strategies” to this part of the guideline. Reviewer Seven added that some of the guideline strategies were ambiguous by expressing, “I don't understand how personalized interactions lead to privacy.”

To respond to the above concerns and to ensure the guideline serves its intended purpose, revisions should be considered for future versions. To clarify, the personalization guideline could be revised to lift the issue of ambiguity. Another consideration is to provide clearer definitions to highlight the distinctions between personalization and privacy. Contradictory strategies could be addressed by streamlining the framework and organizing the categories based on their primary focus. For example, to resolve the conflict of camera use, opt in and opt out options could be added to the strategy to offer more space for learners to feel respected and comfortable in the online environment. To address the concern of large classes, faculty could be trained and offered tools on how to manage sizable classes.

Reviewers' feedback on T.II.2: Timing/Promptness and Immediacy

This guideline was well-received by almost all the reviewers. Seven out of eight reviewers agreed that this guideline was effective and valuable. This indicates that most reviewers appreciated timely faculty responses as a critical component of online learners' support and engagement. Reviewer Three felt that providing prompt responses to learners' concerns and inquiries was a basic responsibility

that all online instructors should shoulder.

Reviewer Three noted, “I mean, it's the least we could do...I don't know why it's so hard for faculty to do this!” Reviewers Four and Eight strongly supported the guideline and described it as rational, backed by research, and carrying good insight. Despite the support this guideline received, the reviewers expressed some concerns related to its applicability and implementation. Despite believing in the value of prompt responses, Reviewer Six was the only reviewer who disagreed with this guideline. Reviewer Six thought the guideline could be better framed by establishing and communicating expectations with the learners at the start of the course. Similarly, Reviewer Five shared an observation about identifying specific periods in the course when increased attention and support are needed. Reviewers Two and Seven each articulated that there was redundancy and overlap within the guideline.

To address these concerns and ensure the guideline meets its planned objectives, key aspects should be considered for future development. One consideration could be addressing the redundancy and repetition identified by Reviewers Two and Seven. This could be done by piecing together similar guidelines with matching themes. To respond to the dissenting opinion of Reviewer Six, a specific requirement could be added to meet the learners’ expectations at the onset of the course. An additional point to consider was from Reviewer Five, who suggested specifying certain times in the course when a heightened level of care and attention is required. They commented, “I think the guideline can specify that there are times in the course when high level of care is needed.” Reviewer Six recommended, “Clear communication expectations should be set up and communicated at the beginning of the semester.”

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.II.3 JEDI Framework

When the reviewers were asked about the effectiveness of the JEDI framework guideline, most of them (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, & R8) found it to be useful and valuable in the ERT environment. For instance, Reviewers One, Four, Five, Six, and Eight strongly supported the considerations of the JEDI

framework in promoting inclusive learning spaces for online learners. Reviewer One noted that the guideline and its strategies aligned well with educational online practices, and acknowledged the importance of making learners feel included by asking for their feedback on the course design and delivery. They commented, “These guidelines fit nicely with the ideas about students as designers/contributors to course design.”

Reviewer Four described the guideline as reasonable and carrying literature supported strategies. Reviewers Six and Eight labeled the guideline as containing “good strategies” and “good ideas.” Reviewer Five praised the guideline and appreciated the principles it advocated for such as inclusion, diversity, and equity. Reviewer Five wrote, “The JEDI framework promotes an inclusive environment and welcomes students from different backgrounds and with different access to resources.”

While the guideline was generally accepted by most of the reviewers, some concerns and limitations were articulated regarding its applicability, scope, and clarity. Reviewers Two and Seven for example, while seeing the JEDI principles as valuable, also criticized them as being too broad, redundant, and vague. Reviewer Two stated, “they seem to be all asking/stating the same thing.” Reviewer Two also mentioned, “It's also not clear how these are all JEDI related.” Reviewer Seven wrote, “The guideline is too broad and the strategies are more specific about allowing students to provide feedback.” In addition to the above-mentioned concerns, Reviewer Three shared some remarks about learners’ bias in providing feedback noting, “most students are biased (there is evidence!) and are absolutely not equipped to give feedback on instruction. So I have little trust here.”

To address the concerns and issues raised by the reviewers, this guideline could be strengthened through several potential strategies. One consideration could be to reduce redundancy by grouping the strategies based on specific JEDI elements to clarify their unique contributions. Another strategy could be offering examples for each JEDI principle. To tackle Reviewer’s Three concern about

bias in feedback, faculty training and support could be offered by institutions on how to collect and interpret feedback. This support could also include faculty training learners on how to provide constructive feedback and avoid bias in the feedback mechanism.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.II.4: Open Communication

All reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, and R8) showed collective appreciation for this guideline, highlighting the importance and value of open communication policy in the remote environment. Reviewers Four, Five, Six, Seven and Eight strongly supported the guideline and believed in its benefit of fostering a positive and successful instructor-learner relationship in the online learning setting. Reviewer Four praised the guideline and described it as reasonable and grounded in research. Reviewer Five appreciated the open and effective communication that this guideline promoted, leading to students' success. Reviewer Five commented, "Open and effective communication develops a stronger instructor-learner relationship, which translates into better performance." Reviewers Six, Seven, and Eight described the guideline as containing "good strategies," well-aligned practices, and "good ideas."

Despite the support and praise for this guideline, the reviewers shared some concerns and observations. For example, Reviewer One appreciated the ideas in the guideline but expressed the need for caution when using several communication methods and tools that may contribute to losing meaning in conversations. Reviewer One stated, "I like some of these ideas but I am cautious about the multiplicity of messaging systems. I think sometimes we 'lose' where the conversations are." Reviewer Two raised the issue of redundancy and overlap, causing cognitive load to the reader. Reviewer Three shared two observations related to tone and offering extra communication applications. Reviewer Three emphasized that tone was a challenging aspect in written exchanges and might get lost in interactions commenting, "I'm a little yes and no on this. Tone is impossible in written communication, but sure, it doesn't hurt to be mindful of it." Reviewer Three also did not see the importance of offering additional

tools to learners external to the learning management system saying, “I don't see the value of offering another communication application outside the LMS.”

To address the reviewers' concerns and ensure the guideline serves its intended usage, some potential enhancements should be considered. One consideration could be introducing a policy for both faculty and learners regarding the use of multiple communications approaches such as email and LMS to ensure both parties have a shared understanding of when and how they are used. To address the redundancy and overlap issue, a comprehensive review of the guideline could be conducted to combine similar strategies. To respond to the challenge of tone, faculty could be trained to be mindful of tone in their communications with learners.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.II.5: Approachability and Relatedness

Most reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R8) confirmed the effectiveness of the guideline in fostering a positive learning environment for online learners. Reviewers Three, Four, and Eight gave their full endorsement of the guideline and its strategies. They supported the guideline, stating that the strategies were reasonable and backed by research (R4) and contained “good ideas” (R8).

The remaining reviewers found the guideline to be effective, but with some reservations. For example, Reviewer Two raised three concerns pertaining to implementation, overload of strategies, and lack of justification. Reviewer Two pointed out that the guideline could be effective, well-intended, and have good strategies, but that its execution could be poorly performed. They thought that implementation should be prioritized over strategy commenting, “it's the implementation of each strategy that makes it effective, not the strategy itself.” Reviewer Two further elaborated and mentioned the example of discussion forums as having a dual nature. To clarify, they could be a positive space for meaningful interactions between students and faculty, or they could be a place for negative exchanges if poorly moderated. They commented on the strategy of creating and moderating discussion forums saying, “depending on how this strategy is implemented, it may foster the development of deep

meanings within students or it may provide an avenue for the sharing of racist, sexist, or agist stereotypes or even bullying (thus the need for moderating).” Reviewer Two provided some rationales behind using discussion fora, saying,

As for reasons why, discussion forums may provide an opportunity for students to (a) process their understandings into a meaningful expression, (b) interact with understandings that are different from their own, (c) question the existence of particular social and cultural institutions, (d) engage in concept change by experiencing cognitive dissonance, (e) foster or modify schemas, (f) motivate deeper processing or critical thinking related to their prior knowledge, (g) develop self-efficacy related to the topic based on personal accomplishment or peer persuasion, (h) test their knowledge and understand vicariously through vicarious reinforcement or punishment of others responses, (i) develop new and trusting relationships with peers and teachers through authenticity, logic, and empathy, etc. :-)

Reviewer One also shared a similar concern about discussion boards, suggesting they were overvalued in educational online learning spaces. However, learners did not see them as effective and meaningful for learner-instructor interactions. Reviewer One asserted, “Regular check ins are essential. I might be a bit out on a limb here, but I think discussion forums are vastly over-rated. They're often seen as a chore by students.”

Reviewer Two pointed out the excessive number of strategies noting, “In reading through these strategies, while I have been asked to address 'why' I would find these strategies effective, there are far too many of them to focus on providing a reasonable explanation of 'why' for each one.” In the same vein, Reviewer Two mentioned a lack of reasoning for the strategies’ inclusion. Reviewers Five, Six, and Seven raised valid concerns that the strategies focused more on technological solutions than on introducing human elements of authenticity, relatedness, personal connections, and interpersonal relationships. For example, Reviewer Five wrote, “In the first strategy, you are not talking about

modalities, but about technologies,” while Reviewer Seven noted, “These strategies are more about using technology to access the instructor. It doesn't mean that the instructor is relatable, only that there are different technologies to access them.”

To respond to the concerns raised by the reviewers and ensure the guideline serves its intended outcomes, potential enhancements should be considered in future. One strategy could be to provide reasoning and clarification for each strategy outlining how and why it should be implemented. Similar strategies can also be combined to reduce the volume. An additional consideration could be humanizing the strategies by stressing personal connections rather than focusing on technological approaches.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.II.6: Accessibility

The majority of reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, R7, & R8) appreciated the guideline and praised its effect in providing a supportive online learning environment. Reviewer One for example, emphasized the value of creating informal learner-instructor interactions to enhance learners' engagement and connections with faculty. Reviewer One mentioned, “This is so important. I try to encourage instructors to get in early and leave late - or make the last 10 mins of class dedicated to this kind of unstructured conversation.” Reviewer Three discussed the necessity of conducting virtual office hours in the online teaching and learning space, even though few faculty actually embrace it. They commented, “Holding virtual office hours should be an absolute imperative in online learning...but again, I see so few faculty use this.” Reviewers Four, Seven, and Eight supported the guideline and described it as literature-supported, simple, and having good ideas.

Two reviewers (R5 & R6) did not appreciate the guideline because of the terminology used to frame it. Both reviewers argued that the terms “accessibility” and “access” were not synonymous and had different interpretations in meaning. Reviewer Five wrote, “I don't think you are using the term 'accessibility' correctly here. You mean access to faculty,” while Reviewer Six said, “Accessibility does not mean access.” According to both reviewers, “accessibility” means designing a learning environment that

is inclusive to all learners, including the ones with disabilities. The meaning of “access,” on the other hand, means availability and contact with the faculty. The distinction emphasized by Reviewers Five and Six is very important in clarifying the guideline.

To address the previously mentioned concerns and ensure the guideline best serves its intended purpose, potential strategies could be implemented to enhance its design. One consideration could be to offer a clear definition of the term “accessibility,” distinguishing it from “access” to avoid confusion and offer clarity. Another suggestion could be to provide additional strategies, as this current guideline contains a singular strategy only. Thus, the framework could be broadened to ensure the guideline’s inclusivity and diversity.

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.II.7: Rapport Building

Out of the eight reviewers, six (R1, R2, R3, R4, R6, & R8) expressed that the guideline was effective, highlighting the importance of rapport building in fostering a supportive learning environment. Reviewers Four, Six, and Eight appreciated the guideline and affirmed its usefulness in teaching during emergency remote teaching (ERT). For example, Reviewer Four described the guideline as “Logical and evidenced in research.” Reviewers Six and Eight labeled the guideline as containing good strategies and ideas.

Despite the praise this guideline received, some reviewers expressed concerns. Reviewers Five and Seven did not see the guideline as effective. Reviewer Five raised an issue related to employing the affective factor in the ERT setting, underscoring the need to prioritize professionalism over friendliness and humor. Reviewer Five wrote, “I’m not sure if you need to always use humor, friendliness, and bring the affective factor in ERT. ERT, and any kind of instruction, should always be professional first, so I’d be concerned if this guideline does not specify that.” Like Reviewer Five, Reviewer Three criticized the guideline and the subjectivity of humor noting, “Humor is pretty subjective though, so faculty should use this very cautiously.” Reviewer Seven also pointed out an observation that the focus of the guideline

was on the instructor-learner relationship rather than peer to peer rapport. Reviewer Seven commented, “The guideline is about the relationships between/among students. But these strategies are primarily about the relationship between the instructor and the student.” This suggests the need to broaden the focus of the guideline to include both faculty-student and student-student interactions.

To address the points raised by the reviewers and ensure the guideline serves its intended purpose, potential strategies can be implemented. To respond to Reviewer’s Three concern about the cautious use of humor in instruction, examples and scenarios about humor could be added to the guideline strategies to demonstrate how it could be used effectively to meet all students’ diverse needs and backgrounds. This guideline could also be strengthened by clearly explaining how humor and friendliness can be integrated in a balanced and professional manner. Another potential consideration could be to broaden the scope of the guideline to include rapport building among students, not only between students and instructors.

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.II.8: Institutional Support/Professional Development

This guideline was largely supported by most of the reviewers with the exception of Reviewer Five. The reviewers endorsed the guideline and recognized the value of fostering self- directed learning. Reviewers Four, Six, Seven, and Eight praised the guideline and described it as reasonable and backed up by research-informed literature, containing good ideas and well- aligned strategies.

Some criticism and concerns were also raised by the reviewers. Reviewer One, for example, acknowledged the complexity of applying this guideline. Reviewer One believed that the guideline was more complicated than simply having conversations with students about self- directed learning, self- regulation, and self-efficacy. They also felt that teachers might not be confident or subject matter experts on these topics, commenting, “Yes, but I think this is more complicated than just 'chats'. Also, many faculty are not confident or expert in these areas themselves.” Reviewer Two raised the issue of repetition and redundancy within the guideline. Reviewer Two also pointed out the issue of faculty

being unfamiliar with the content noting, “S.II.8.a again raises the issue as to whether or not all faculty or teachers should be teaching this content, content with which they are unlikely to be familiar.” Despite endorsing the guideline, Reviewer Three expressed the effectiveness of adding deadlines, commenting, “Yes, but it's hard to get students to be self-directed. That's why deadlines are so important ...” Reviewer Five criticized the guideline and mentioned a lack of connection between the proposed strategies and the concept of institutional support. Reviewer Five wrote, “I don't see that connection between the strategies and the term institutional support.”

To respond to the reviewers' feedback and ensure the guideline achieves its intended purpose, potential strategies for enhancement are proposed. To address the concern raised by Reviewer One and Two regarding faculty confidence and unfamiliarity, one consideration could be to offer professional development opportunities such as resources and training workshops on concepts such as self-directed learning, self-regulation, and self-efficacy. Another potential strategy could be to include a balanced approach of structured deadlines and opportunities for self-direction within the guideline, making students feel supported and empowered to take charge of their own learning.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.II.9: Instructional Scaffolding

Most reviewers (R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R8) appreciated this guideline and its effectiveness in fostering students' engagement and learning. For example, Reviewer One thought that instructional scaffolding was an essential component of effective teaching practices and should be a basic and fundamental pedagogy implemented by all instructors in the ERT environment. Reviewer One commented, “This should be standard practice in every course.” Reviewer Four described the guideline as supported by established educational foundations, noting that the guideline was “Logical and evidenced in research.” Reviewers Five and Eight described the guideline as useful for learners who were doing independent and autonomous online learning commenting, “Scaffolding is effective to teach students who are taking online and self-paced instruction.”

Despite the overall positive feedback, some concerns and reservations were raised about the guideline's utility and implementation. For example, Reviewers Six and Seven did not see the guideline as effective. Reviewer Seven described it as "too vague" and lacking in clarity. Reviewer Three also shared a crucial insight about the effectiveness of this guideline in a normal 16-week period. They expressed that it could be challenging to implement it in an accelerated course format commenting, "yes, this makes sense in a traditional, 16 week course. It's hard in an accelerated environment." This guideline could be enhanced by following some of the reviewers' suggestions. One potential strategy could be to make the guideline more specific by giving the faculty examples for how to implement scaffolding strategies such as offering structured assignments, constant effective feedback, and more opportunities for students to collaborate and reflect. Consideration should also be given to whether the online course is on a conventional schedule versus short and accelerated.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.II.10: Presence, Availability, and Community Building

All eight reviewers acknowledged the effectiveness of this guideline and gave a high-level endorsement of its importance in fostering interaction and engagement in an online learning environment. Reviewers Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven, and Eight strongly appreciated the guideline and praised its value. For example, Reviewer Three was a strong advocate for online communities of practice commenting, "Yes, I am a huge proponent of creating online communities of practice." Reviewer Four supported the guideline and its strategies, describing them as backed up by research-informed literature and educational practices. Reviewer Four wrote that the guideline was, "Logical and evidenced in research." Reviewer Five also commented, "These strategies help in the development of social presence." Reviewers Six, Seven, and Eight labeled the guideline as containing "good strategies" and "good ideas," and stated that they were well-aligned.

Despite the praise of this guideline, there were some concerns and observations shared by Reviewers One and Two. Reviewer One, for instance, raised the issue of redundancy in this guideline

and its similarity with other previously stated guidelines. Reviewer Two similarly critiqued this guideline, as it was repeated in another section called “Modeling.” Reviewer Two also questioned the difference between Modeling and Dialogue saying, “Reading these Dialogue strategies it's unclear what the differences are between Modeling and Dialogue.”

To respond to these concerns and ensure the guideline serves its best intended purpose, some potential strategies could be considered to improve this guideline. To address the concerns of Reviewers One and Two, some of the strategies could be combined to reduce repetition and volume. Reviewer Two mentioned, “Reading these Dialogue strategies it's unclear what the differences are between Modeling and Dialogue.” Another strategy could be staying more considerate about learners’ diversity (learning pace, backgrounds, and needs) and their readiness level in the online learning setting. Reviewer Two commented, “I think there is some space for consideration re: different learning timelines and what is feasible within in them.”

Reviewers’ Feedback on Practice

This section outlines the reviewers’ evaluations for the third care element: Practice. This element is comprised of three main themes (T): T.1. Peer Mentoring, T.2. Collaboration/Peer- to-Peer Support, and T.III.3 Social Presence and Community Building.

Reviewer Feedback on T.III.1: Peer Mentoring

Overall, there were positive responses from the reviewers regarding the effectiveness of this peer mentoring guideline. Most of the reviewers (R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, & R8) supported and appreciated the benefits that this guideline would bring to online learning environments. For example, Reviewer Five noted that peer mentoring, “contributes to social presence in online environments and creates community, which is effective in learning environments.” Reviewers Six and Eight also believed that this guideline offered good ideas and strategies.

Reviewer One did not see the effectiveness and importance of in-class peer mentoring, saying,

“I’m not convinced that in-class peer mentoring is that effective.” Although the reviewers supported this guideline, they expressed some concerns related to its implementation and applicability. To clarify, although peer mentoring was a good strategy to use within the online space, its implementation hinged on factors such as the type of the course, the type of students, and the type of teaching style. For example, Reviewer Two mentioned, “While this strategy is good, in general, it’s implementation will depend to a large extent on the nature of the course, the nature of the students, and the nature of the teacher.” Reviewer Three also raised the issue of implementing this strategy with different course formats and different learner demographics (graduate vs. undergraduate).

In response to these concerns, the following discussion addresses potential revisions that could be made to refine the guideline in future. For example, to address the first reviewer’s concern about the effectiveness of the guideline for traditional peer mentoring, more research and investigation could be conducted to discuss the benefits of peer mentoring for online environments. To best serve the purpose and the intended usage of this guideline, additional consideration could be given to the context it was designed for (e.g., the learners, the course, and the teaching style).

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.III.2: Collaboration/Peer-to-Peer Support

Generally, there was a consensus among all the reviewers on the effectiveness of peer collaboration and peer-to-peer support in the online environment. When the reviewers were asked whether the guideline was effective, they all responded “Yes.” Reviewer One, for instance, believed that this strategy should be promoted and encouraged among learners in the online space since it supported a collective mindset over individualism. Reviewer One stated, “Yes, this should be encouraged. I think it relates to efforts to build a cohort mindset, rather than an individualistic one.” In addition to this, Reviewer Five believed that this guideline contributed positively to social presence, support, and expertise in the digital learning context. Other reviewers also praised the effectiveness of this guideline, and described the strategies as “good,” “logical,” and backed by research-informed literature.

Despite the reviewers' affirmative responses, they did express some concerns and shortcomings related to the challenge of implementing the strategies for this guideline. For instance, Reviewer Two noted redundancy in the strategies, suggesting that the third was merely an extension of the second. He recommended that strategies be merged and combined where possible to reduce the volume of strategies. Reviewer Three also shared a concern about faculty monitoring the "caring behavior" among learners, feeling that this was impractical and pointless.

To address these concerns and ensure the guideline serves its intended purpose, some aspects should be considered for future revision. Potential considerations include minimizing the number of strategies and combining the third strategy of applying technology tools with the second strategy. This enhanced guideline could be, "Encourage collaborative learning, potentially through the application of tools such as Google drive and one drive" as noted by Reviewer Two.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.III.3: Social Presence and Community Building

This guideline was viewed as positive by a majority of the reviewers (7 out of 8). All the reviewers (except Reviewer Three) supported and appreciated the effectiveness of this guideline to promote social presence and enhance community building among online learners. Reviewers Four, Six, Seven, and Eight labeled the strategies as, "logical and evidenced in research," "good," and stated that "they align" with online best practices. Further, Reviewer Five commended the guideline and the strategies of group work and interactions as the most successful methods to foster social presence in the ERT classroom.

The reviewers also shared some concerns related to implementing this guideline. For instance, Reviewer Three did not support the strategy of using technology tools external to the learning management system (LMS) for communication and collaboration. Reviewer Three only appreciated the use of outside tools such as Lucid Chart for assignments. Reviewer One and Two also noted some challenges pertinent to "time constraints" and having "different expectations" when doing groupwork

among online learners. Reviewer Two also discussed that “team teaching” hinged on some factors related to, “the nature of the content, students, and teacher.”

To address these concerns and ensure the guideline meets its intended goals, revisions should be considered for future versions. For example, one revision could consider faculty workload and offer more flexible approaches that do not require extra time or effort. Another enhanced version of the guideline could involve integrating tools within the same LMS to promote collaboration and interaction in remote learning contexts. In addition, to enhance the implementation of this guideline, faculty could be provided with resources and tools on time management and tackling varying learners’ expectations.

Reviewers’ Feedback on Confirmation

This section outlines the reviewers’ evaluation for the third care element: Confirmation. It is comprised of three main themes (T): T.IV.1 Personalization, T.IV.2 Pacing, and T.IV.3 Institutional Support/Professional Development (PD).

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.IV.1: Personalization

Out of the eight reviewers, seven believed that the guideline of providing personalized feedback for online learners was effective and useful in online teaching and learning contexts. Reviewer One for example, viewed providing clear feedback to online learners as an essential and challenging skill that faculty can develop. Reviewer One wrote, “I think clear feedback is one of the most important skills faculty can have - it’s also one of the hardest to develop.” Reviewer Three also appreciated this guideline and looked at it as a baseline standard that was not only effective, but a fundamental skill that each faculty should have in the online environment. They noted, “Absolutely. Again, this should be considered basic.” More positive feedback on this guideline was shared by Reviewer Five. This reviewer underscored the importance of relationship development in delivering personalized feedback, emphasizing that it signaled direct engagement and connection between the online instructor and the learners. Reviewer Five stated, “Personalized feedback sends a clear message to the learner that the

faculty is directly engaged with the learner's work.” In addition, Reviewers Four, Six, and Eight praised this guideline, labeling it as “logical and evidenced in research,” and containing “good ideas” and “good strategies.”

The reviewers also shared some concerns and limitations pertinent to this guideline’s utility and implementation. For example, Reviewer Seven did not see this guideline as effective. They felt confusion with the terminology asserting, “I don't understand the last part about 'best behaviors' and qualities.” This reviewer also hinted at a lack of connection between the guideline and its proposed strategies saying, “The strategies don't suggest that they need to do that. The first one says affirm abilities, but that isn't necessarily their best behaviors or qualities.” Reviewer Two commented on the organizational structure of the guideline and mentioned, “This set of strategy seems like a subset to previous strategies related to personalization in feedback.”

To address these concerns and ensure the guideline achieves its intended outcomes, revisions should be considered for future iterations. Some of these revisions could include addressing the concern raised by Reviewer Two by categorizing the strategies in a hierarchical format from general to more specific. Reviewer Two stated, “it would be better to organize these lists based on category, general strategy, and specific strategies.” Another key area that should be improved is eliminating confusion with the terminology in response to Reviewer Seven. This enhancement could be made by rewording the guideline to make it clearer and more specific.

Reviewers’ Feedback on T.IV.2: Pacing

When the reviewers were asked about the effectiveness of the pacing guideline, six appreciated and supported its usefulness highlighting its value in the online teaching and learning space. Reviewers One, Three, and Five emphasized the importance of delivering timely feedback to students, with a focus on how and when this feedback should be provided.

Reviewer One stressed that feedback should be delivered early in the course because it would

lose its value if given at the end of the course. While pacing assignments was paramount, the timing of the feedback delivery was critical. Reviewer One noted, “I think feedback should come earlier in the course- there's almost no value in providing feedback on final assessments - as that's often the terminal point for students.” Reviewer Two also appreciated the inclusion of an example for this guideline, which made it more concrete and accessible. Reviewer Five viewed the seven-day window in feedback delivery as a reasonable amount of time that would allow learners to process the feedback and act on it. Reviewer Five commented, “This gives ample time to the learner to read feedback, process it, and apply it.”

Despite the appreciation and the support given to this guideline’s utility, there were some concerns and limitations expressed by the reviewers. The following discussion outlines these concerns. Reviewer Three for example, raised the issue of students getting impatient and evaluating the instructor poorly because of not meeting their expectations for the feedback giving process stating, “However, I find that most don't want to wait seven days and will assess your teaching poorly if it takes that long.” Reviewer Six found the pacing of assignments in this guideline to be valuable. Reviewer Six wrote, “Building pacing and consistency pattern seems both important.” Reviewer Seven criticized the guideline for ambiguity and a lack of clarity saying, “It's not clear what is meant by pace between assignments.”

In response to these concerns and to ensure the guideline meets its intended goals, some suggestions should be considered for future guideline design. One potential consideration could emphasize the timing of the feedback and the value of providing early feedback to students in the course. Another enhanced version of the guideline could include definitions for faculty to clarify terminologies such as “pacing between assignments.” This might help to make the guideline more practical and more accessible for faculty to apply. Future design could also include addressing and managing learners’ expectations at the beginning of the course in relation to the timing of feedback. To

address the consistency concern, a future guideline design could integrate consistency patterns in assignment planning, feedback delivery administration, and pacing.

Reviewers' Feedback on T.IV.3: Institutional Support/PD

This guideline was supported by all the reviewers (R1-R8). They all responded positively, agreeing that the guideline was effective and useful. Reviewer Four praised the guideline and labeled it as literature supported saying, "Logical and evidenced in research." In addition, Reviewers Six and Eight appreciated the guideline and described it as including "good strategies" and "good ideas."

The reviewers shared some concerns regarding this guideline. These concerns are centered around repetition and redundancy. Three reviewers (R1, R2, & R7) noted redundancy and overlap in the guideline strategies. Another concern was a lack of clarity and alignment (R2 & R5). Reviewer Two felt that the third strategy was not in line with the rest of the proposed strategies noting, "The final strategy doesn't seem to align with the rest of the strategies in focus." Reviewer Five criticized the name of the guideline, describing it as, "not connected to the strategies." Reviewer Three gave an unusual negative remark about instructional designers, describing them as "bureaucrats" and uncaring about learning. Reviewer Three mentioned, "It would be nice if instructional designers knew anything about their jobs. In my experience, they are bureaucrats who don't actually care about learning."

Although this guideline was largely supported, some reviewer concerns and observations need to be addressed. Potential considerations could include reducing repetition and overlap of guidelines by combining and merging them with similar guidelines. Another recommendation could be to enhance clarity by aligning the guideline more carefully with the guideline's name and objective. To address the instructional designer criticism, more collaboration and communication between instructors and instructional designers can be encouraged to avoid dissatisfaction.

Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of the steps and procedures undertaken to develop the

guidelines and their associated strategies. It also included details about the QuestionPro survey, the process of recruiting reviewers, and the participating expert reviewers. Additionally, the chapter has presented the expert reviewers' perspectives, feedback, and recommendations for enhancing the design of the guidelines. Overall, the expert reviewers' responses varied from fully endorsing the proposed guidelines and partially accepting them to a few who did not see them as effective. Given the scope and limitations of this study, the recommendations and proposed improvements to the guidelines will be considered in future revisions.

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of this design and development research (DDR) study. It summarizes the steps and key aspects of this Type 2 model research. Further, it highlights both the theoretical and practical contributions of the study to the existing body of knowledge. In addition, it discusses the study's limitations and finally concludes with implications for future research directions.

Research Overview and Summary

Motivated by the global challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, this design and development research study aimed to create a faculty development and training framework specifically for future emergency remote teaching (ERT) contexts. The study proposed 30 guidelines with accompanying 136 strategies to guide faculty to integrate care pedagogy into their online instruction and optimize their teaching experiences during potential future ERT scenarios. Hence, this faculty development framework is called CARE: Care adoption in remote environments.

The researcher is particularly driven by the belief that ERT presents a unique opportunity for faculty to adapt to online teaching environments, especially in regions where systematic digital delivery was underdeveloped prior to the pandemic (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Al Harthy & Al Ani, 2023; Al-Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020).

The current DDR study is an early exploration of faculty development in a post-COVID-19 world, focusing on the integration of care-informed pedagogy. It addresses the need for effective, compassionate teaching frameworks that can assist instructors to improve student motivation, engagement, retention, and overall learning outcomes. In this post-pandemic era, it is essential that faculty development programs provide educators with the tools and strategies necessary to foster a

more supportive and effective online learning environment.

The development and design of this DDR study guidelines followed a systematic five-step process (analysis, design, development, implementation, & evaluation). This approach involved reviewing relevant scholarly literature to identify care-related themes, categorizing strategies that support these themes, and then designing guidelines that align with both. The identified themes, derived from care pedagogy, faculty development, and emergency remote teaching literature, were organized according to Noddings' (2010, 2012a, 2012b) four care elements: Modeling, Dialogue, Practice, and Confirmation.

Key themes under the Modeling element of care included approachability and relatedness, instructor presence and availability, deliberate personalization, fostering interest and engagement, adherence to the JEDI framework (Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion), faculty preparedness for online teaching, compassionate flexibility, accessibility, instructional scaffolding, immediacy and promptness, technical competence, institutional support, cognitive load reduction, and self-care during crises. The Dialogue element encompassed themes such as personalization, timing and promptness, open communication, rapport building, accessibility, approachability, JEDI principles, instructor presence, institutional support, and instructional scaffolding. For Practice, the third care element, themes include peer mentoring, collaboration, peer-to-peer support, and fostering social presence and community building. Lastly, Confirmation included themes related to personalization, pacing, and institutional support.

Theoretical and Practical Contributions of the Study

Instructional design and technology field is an empirical and applied discipline that is often characterized by the incorporation of theoretical frameworks and practical implementation. This study adopted a design and development research methodology by utilizing the Type 2 model (Richey & Klein, 2007). The aim of the research is to develop a set of faculty development guidelines that facilitate the

integration of care pedagogy within higher education institutions, particularly in the context of Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT). The following section outlines the theoretical and practical contributions of this DDR study.

This study contributes to the theoretical understanding of care pedagogy in the context of Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) by highlighting its potential to address the emotional and psychological needs of learners during challenging times of crises. Drawing from the care pedagogy framework, the study suggests that integrating care-informed approaches can mitigate the negative effects of stress, anxiety, isolation, and fear which are familiar challenges faced by students in ERT settings (Al Sulaimi, 2022; Maican & Cocoradă, 2021).

Furthermore, the research extends care pedagogy theory by emphasizing its application beyond pandemic-triggered ERT, suggesting that this approach is equally relevant in other emergency contexts, such as natural disasters or crises (Hodges et al., 2020). By introducing care-informed framework into faculty development, this study also offers new theoretical insights into how educators' emotional competencies can directly impact students' well-being, engagement, and retention, leading to advance the literature on online teaching and learning, including emergency situations.

In practice, this study offers a faculty development model for ERT contexts, designed to equip online educators with the skills necessary to successfully facilitate students' psychological and emotional well-being and success during crises. By integrating care pedagogy into faculty training, the study emphasizes the value of developing competencies that can enhance the quality of online education in emergency settings. Instructors are positioned as key facilitators of student success, and by incorporating care-informed strategies into their teaching, educators can improve student motivation, engagement, and retention, even in remote or stressful learning environments (Burke & Larmar, 2020; Bunger, 2021; Zuo & Ives, 2022). Additionally, the study highlights the long-term practical benefits of care pedagogy, noting that the competencies developed through this framework can be applied in any

online teaching context, not just during ERT. Doing so offers sustainable value for institutions that could not and may not have a formalized online teaching system (Al-Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Hebert et al., 2022).

Besides faculty members, instructional designers, faculty developers, policymakers, administrators, and other institutions top officials can benefit from the outcomes of this study. The provided insights will help these stakeholders make informed decisions that best support students' physical and emotional well-being. The findings of this study also contribute to a more holistic, compassionate approach to faculty development programs that can be adapted for numerous educational settings, eventually improving the overall quality and inclusivity of online instruction.

Study Limitations

Although the care-driven guidelines have been reviewed and validated by a panel of eight subject matter experts (SMEs), they have not yet been tested in real time of emergency with actual users, such as online faculty and instructors. Therefore, several key design steps have not been addressed. These include developing measurable goals and objectives, selecting appropriate media and technology, and writing clear instructional materials. Furthermore, the selection of delivery platforms and modalities (synchronous, asynchronous, & blended) has not been considered. As a result, a final evaluation plan for the above activities has been lacking in the process.

Based on the feedback and recommendations from the expert reviewers, the guidelines may require further revisions to create an improved version. Additionally, there are procedural limitations in this study. For instance, some terms and definitions such as presence and availability, relatedness and approachability, self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and institutional support, among others need to be more clearly linked to the associated strategies to eliminate ambiguity. Another limitation identified by the expert reviewers was the overlap and redundancy found in some of the strategies, despite the disclaimer provided at the beginning of the document. Furthermore, this study relied solely on data

from extant literature and expert review survey participation, without conducting follow-up interviews with the expert reviewers to clarify or expand upon their responses from the QuestionPro survey.

Recommendations for Future Research Directions

This DDR study produced care-informed guidelines to function as a framework to guide online educators to how effectively integrate care-full pedagogy into their teaching practices during any future emergency remote teaching. A more enhanced version of this set of guidelines could be executed if the following recommendations are followed. First, future DDR study should test and pilot this set of guidelines on actual users such as online faculty and instructors in real time of crises to genuinely evaluate and assess their effectiveness. Collecting feedback and comments from the genuine respondents may help identify voids or areas for improvement that have been overlooked during the expert review process. Second, to address the earlier mentioned limitations, it is recommended to consider some design aspects such as developing measurable goals and objectives, selecting suitable technology tools, creating appropriate instructional materials, considering the selection of platforms and modalities, and developing an evaluation plan to assess the effectiveness and success of the guidelines.

In addition, future versions of this DDR should focus on clarifying terminologies and concepts that are unfamiliar and that are key in the guideline execution to ensure consistent understanding of intended meaning among all educators. Further, future research of this study should use follow-up interviews to deepen the insights gathered from the expert reviewers and check accuracy of meanings. By addressing these recommendations, future research could improve the rigor, applicability, and relevance of these care-oriented guidelines, resulting in more effective outcomes in real-world educational contexts.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this chapter has offered an overview of the design and development research

(DDR) study, summarizing its key elements. Driven by the disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic, this DDR aimed to develop a faculty development framework for future emergency remote teaching (ERT) settings. It designed 30 guidelines and 136 strategies to help faculty integrate care pedagogy into online instruction and enhance their teaching effectiveness during potential future ERT scenarios. It also highlighted both the theoretical and practical contributions the study makes to current scholarly literature. Further, the chapter addressed the study's limitations and ultimately concluded with suggestions and recommendations for future research endeavors.

REFERENCES

- Abdulsattar, G., Al-Saifi, S., Al-Shidi, R. A., & Al-Shukaili, S. Z. (2021). The quality of selected online learning platforms and their effect on education in the Sultanate of Oman. *Education Research International*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/2570377>
- Affouneh, S., Salha, S., & Khlaif, Z. N. (2020). Designing quality e-Learning environments for emergency remote teaching in coronavirus crisis. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Virtual Learning in Medical Sciences*, 11(2), 1-3.
- Akcaoglu, M., & Lee, E. (2016). Increasing social presence in online learning through small group discussions. *International Review of Research in Open & Distributed Learning*, 17(3), 1–17. <https://doi/10.19173/irrodl.v17i3.2293>
- Aktar, T., Maniruzzaman, M., Khan, H. R., & Hasan, M. (2022). Teachers' narratives from initial virtual classrooms and professional development during the covid-19 pandemic in developing Bangladesh. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 23(3), 230–245. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1137293>
- Al Sulaimi, S. (2022). Teacher-student rapport in emergency remote teaching: Autoethnography. *Studies in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 2(3). <https://doi.org/10.21428/8c225f6e.8851078e>
- Al Wardy, N. (2020). Faculty development initiatives at the College of Medicine & Health Sciences, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman. *Sultan Qaboos University Medical Journal*, 20(3), 278. <https://doi.org/10.18295/squmj.2020.20.03.005>
- Al-Freih, M. (2021). The impact of faculty experience with emergency remote teaching: An interpretive phenomenological study. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 9(2), 7–23.
- Al-Harthi, A., & Ani, W. (2023). Learner readiness for MOOCs in Omani higher education institutions:

- Disparities between projections and reality. *Education Information Technology*, 28, 303–319
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11183-5>
- Al-Maqbali, A. H., & Raja Hussain, R. (2022). The impact of online assessment challenges on assessment principles during COVID-19 in Oman. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 19(2), 73-92. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.19.2.6>
- Al-Naabi, I., & Al-Abri, A. (2021). E-learning implementation barriers during COVID-19: A cross-sectional survey design. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(8), 176-193. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.8.11>
- Altillo, B. S. A., Gray, M., Avashia, S. B., Norwood, A., Nelson, E. A., Johnston, C., Bhavnani, D., Patel, H., Allen, C. H., Adeni, S., Phelps, N. D., & Mercer, T. (2021). Global health on the front lines: An innovative medical student elective combining education and service during the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMC Medical Education*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02616-9>
- Ansyari, M. F., Groot, W., & De Witte, K. (2022). Teachers' preferences for online professional development: Evidence from a discrete choice experiment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 119, 103870. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103870>
- Aparicio, M., Bacao, F., & Oliveira, T. (2016). Cultural impacts on e-learning systems' success. *The Internet and Higher Education*, [https://doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2016.06.003)
- Baker, V.L. & Lutz, C.H. (2021). Faculty development post COVID-19: A cross-Atlantic conversation and call to action. *The Journal of the Professoriate*, 12(1), 55–79.
- Baran, E., & Al Zoubi, D. (2020). Human-centered design as a frame for transition to remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 365-372.
- Baran, E., & Correia, A. P. (2014). A professional development framework for online teaching. *TechTrends*, 58(5), 95-101. <https://doi:10.1007/s11528-014-0791-0>

- Baran, E., Correia, A.P., & Thompson, A. (2011). Transforming online teaching practice: Critical analysis of the literature on the roles and competencies of online teachers. *Distance Education*, 32(3), 421–439.
- Barr, N. B., & Johnson, J. E. (2021). Trajectories in turmoil: A case study of engineering students' reactions to disruptions in their community of practice. *IEEE transactions on professional communication*, 64(1), 38–51. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2021.3057149>
- Bolliger, D. U., & Halupa, C. (2022). An investigation of instructors' online teaching readiness. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning*, 66(2), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-021-00654-0>
- Borowiec, K., Deoksoon Kim, Lizhou (Jo) Wang, Julie Kim, & Wortham, S. (2021). Supporting holistic student development through online community building. *Online Learning*, 25(4), 125–155. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v25i4.2882>
- Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirschi, V., Schuwer, R., & Egorov, G. (2020). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1–126. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3878572>.
- Bozkurt, A., Jung, I., Xiao, J., Vladimirschi, V., Schuwer, R., & Egorov, G. (2020). A global outlook to the interruption of education due to COVID-19 pandemic: Navigating in a time of uncertainty and crisis. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 15(1), 1–126. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3878572>.
- Bramer, W. M., de, J. G. B., Mast, F., Rethlefsen, M. L., & Kleijnen, J. (2018). A systematic approach to searching: an efficient and complete method to develop literature searches. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 106(4), 531–541. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2018.283>
- Brooks, C. F. (2010). Toward 'hybridised' faculty development for the twenty-first century: Blending

- online communities of practice and face-to-face meetings in instructional and professional support programmes. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 47(3), 261–270.
- Brown, M. M., & Brudney, J. L. (2004). Achieving advanced electronic government services: Opposing environmental constraints. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 28, 96-113.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2004.11051819>
- Bunger, A. (2021). Active learning in emergency remote introductory linguistics: Successes and challenges. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, 6(2), 5102.
<https://doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v6i2.5102>
- Çakiroğlu, Ü., Aydın, M., Kurtoğlu, Y. B., & Cebeci, Ü. (2023). How instructors' TPACK developed during emergency remote teaching: Evidence from instructors in faculties of education. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 24(2), 162–188.
<https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v24i2.7177>
- Campbell, J. J. (2015). Three ways to make the virtual classroom personal. *University Business*, 18(11), 49.
- Castro-Bedriñana, J., Chirinos-Peinado, D., & Castro-Chirinos, G. (2022). Emergency remote education satisfaction during COVID-19 at a Public University in Central Andes, Peru with low resources and little online teaching experience. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 22(1), 46–61.
<https://doi-org./10.12738/jestp.2022.1.0005>
- Chang, C., Shen, H., & Zhi-Feng Liu, E. (2014). University faculty's perspectives on the roles of E-Instructors and their online instruction practice. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning*, 15(3), 72–92.
- Compen, B., De Witte, K., & Schelfhout, W. (2019). The role of teacher professional development in financial literacy education: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review*, 26, 16e31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.12.001>

- Covelli, B., & Roy, S. (2022). Emergency remote teaching versus planned remote teaching: Narrowing the gap with targeted professional development. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 12(2), 74–91. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v12i2.1340>
- Crespín-Trujillo, V., & Hora, M. T. (2021). Teaching during a pandemic: Insights into faculty teaching practices and implications for future improvement. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, (195), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20463>
- Cutri, R. M., & Mena, J. (2020). A critical reconceptualization of faculty readiness for online teaching. *Distance Education*, 41(3), 361–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1763167>
- Dalton, D., Hassan, A., Mejri, S. B., & Omer, A. (2023). Capturing the personal and pedagogical experiences of faculty during emergency response teaching at a research university in Abu Dhabi. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 15(3), 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v15i3.4691>
- Damarin, S. K. (1994). Equity, caring, and beyond: Can feminist ethics inform educational technology? *Educational Technology*, 34(2), 34–39.
- Doornbos, L. (2020). Emergency remote learning: Seeing, understanding, and disrupting racism. *Journal of International Social Studies*, 10, 76–89.
- Dragisich, V. (2020). Wellness and community modules in a graduate teaching assistant training course in the time of pandemic. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 97(9), 3341–3345.
- Edwards, F. L. (2012). Cultural competency in disasters. In K. A. Norman Major & S. T. Gooden (Eds.), *Cultural competency for public administrators* (pp. 197–218). Routledge.
- Ellis, A., & Phelps, R. (2000). Staff development for online delivery: A collaborative, team-based action learning model. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 16(1), 26–44.
- Erdem-Aydin, İ. (2021). Investigation of higher education instructors' perspectives towards emergency

remote teaching. *Educational Media International*, 58(1), 78–98.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2021.1908501>

Feldmann-Jensen, S., Hackerott, C., Knox, C. C., Ramsay, J., McEntire, D. A., & Jerolleman, A. (2019). The scholarship of teaching and learning in emergency management and homeland security: Trends, gaps, barriers, and opportunities. *Journal of Emergency Management*, 17(1), 27–34.

Fray-Aiken, C., & Campbell-Grizzle, E. (2015). Activating faculty interest in online teaching: A Jamaican perspective. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 43(3), 21–30.

Gagne, R. M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction* (4th ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (1999). 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6)

Gelles, L. A., Lord, S. M., Hoople, G. D., Chen, D. A., & Mejia, J. A. (2020). Compassionate flexibility and self-discipline: Student adaptation to emergency remote teaching in an integrated engineering energy course during covid-19. *Education Sciences*, 10.

Gilligan, C.J. (1982). *In a Different Voice*. Harvard University Press.

Gordon, S., P. Benner, & N. Noddings. (1996). *Caregiving: Readings in knowledge, practice, ethics, and politics*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Green, J.K., Burrow, M.S. & Carvalho, L. (2020). Designing for transition: Supporting teachers and students cope with emergency remote education. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 2, 906–922.

Hartline, A., Conklin, S., & Dikkers, A. G. (2022). Through their eyes: Student perspectives. *Journal of Open, Flexible and Distance Learning*, 26(1), 5–26.

Hebert, E., Wood, R., Jeon, K., & Reena, I. (2022). Faculty making the emergency online transition during

the COVID-19 pandemic: The effects of prior online teaching experience and strategies used to learn to teach online. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 12, 59–76.

10.18870/hlrc.v12i0.1322

Hess, K., McAuliffe, E. L., Gleckman-Krut, M., & Shapiro, S. (2022). Learning from 2020: How the Challenges of remote teaching reinforce the need for care-informed pedagogy. *Teaching Sociology*, 50(1), 3-16. <https://doi/10.1177/0092055X211060344>

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020, March 27). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*.
<https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>

Hung, M. L., Chou, C., Chen, C. H., & Own, Z. Y. (2010). Learner readiness for online learning: Scale development and student perceptions. *Computers & Education*, 55(3), 1080–1090.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.05.004>

Hunt, D. H., Davies, K., Richardson, D., Hammock, G., Atkins, M., & Russ, L. (2014). It is (more) about the students: Faculty motivations and concerns regarding teaching online. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 17(3).
http://www.westga.edu/*distance/ojdl/summer172/Hunt_Davies_Richardson_Hammock_Akins_Russ172.html

Jaeger-Hauer, R. (2021). *Let's Talk: The caring university instructor*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. Minot State University.

James, T., Bond, K., Kumar, B., Tomlins, M., & Toth, G. (2022). We were all learning and doing our best: Investigating how Enabling educators promoted student belonging in a time of significant complexity and unpredictability. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 19(4).

<https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol19/iss4/18>

Johnson, N., Veletsianos, G., & Seaman, J. (2020). U.S. Faculty and administrators' experiences and approaches in the early weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Online Learning*, 24(2), 6–21.

<https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i2.2285>

Jones, B. D. (2018). *Motivating students by design: Practical strategies for professors* (2nd ed.). Charleston, SC: CreateSpace.

Jones, B. D. (2019). Testing the Model of Motivation Theory: Relationships between students' perceptions, engagement, and overall MUSIC ratings. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 10(3), 1–15.

<https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2019.3.9471>

Jones, B. D. (2021). *Caring Strategies*. The MUSIC Model of Motivation.

<https://www.themusicmodel.com/caring/>

Jones, B. D. (2021). *Caring Strategies*. The MUSIC Model of Motivation.

<https://www.themusicmodel.com/caring/>

Karakaya, K. (2021). Design considerations in emergency remote teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic: A human-centered approach. *Educational Technology Research & Development*,

69(1), 295–299. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09884-0>

Khtere, A. R., & Yousef, A. M. F. (2021). The professionalism of Online teaching in Arab universities: Validation of faculty readiness. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 24(3), 1–12.

Kilis, S., & Yildirim, Z. (2019). Posting patterns of students' social presence, cognitive presence, and teaching presence in online learning. *Online Learning*, 23(2), 179–195.

<https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i2.1460>

Kızılıçık, H., & Türüdü, A. S. D. (2022). Humanising online teaching through care-centred pedagogies.

Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 38(4), 143–159. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7872>

- Knox, C. C., Emrich, C., & Haupt, B. (2019). Advancing emergency management higher education: Importance of cultural competence scholarship. *Journal of Emergency Management*, 17(2), 111–117.
- Koehler, M. and Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9(1), 63.
(<https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/29544/>).
- Krpan, D., & Stankov, S. (2009). 51st International Symposium ELMAR-2009 Zadar. Standards and specifications for e-learning systems. Proceedings Elmar - *International Symposium Electronics in Marine*, 189–192.
- Lambrev, V. S., & Cruz, B. C. (2021). Becoming scholarly practitioners: Creating community in online professional doctoral education. *Distance Education*, 42(4), 567–581.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2021.1986374>
- Larsen, A. (2015). *Who cares? Developing a pedagogy of care in Higher education*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. *Utah State University*. <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/4287>
- Lederman, D. (2018). *Who is studying online (and Where)?* Inside Higher Ed.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/digitallearning/article/2018/01/05/new-us-data-show-continued-growth-college-students-studying>
- Lennick, D., & Kiel, F., (2011). *Moral intelligence 2.0: Enhancing business performance and leadership success in turbulent times*. Pearson.
- Lockee, B. B. (2020). Designing forward: Instructional design considerations for online learning in the COVID-19 context. *Journal of Applied Instructional Design*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.51869/93bl>

- Magd, H., & Jonathan H. (2023). Limitations and challenges of online teaching at higher education institutions in Oman. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 13(5).
- Maican, M. A., & Cocoradă, E. (2021). Online foreign language learning in higher education and its correlates during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 13(2), 781.
- Markovic, M., Pavlovic, D., & Mamutovic, A. (2021). Students' experiences and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(5), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7138>
- Martin, F., Parker, M., & Allred Oyarzun, B. (2013). A case study on the adoption and use of synchronous virtual classrooms. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, 11(2), 124–138.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *The Schoolhome*. Harvard University Press.
- Mastel-Smith, B., Post, J., & Lake, P. (2015). Online teaching: Are you there, and do you care? *Journal of Nursing Education*, 54(3), 145–151. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20150218-18>
- Matos, N. (2017). Commentary: What My Struggling Students Wanted Me to Understand. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 64(9), 1.
- Meda, L., & Albukhari, H. (2023). A nested approach to supporting special education need and disabled students in online learning. *Journal of Educators Online*, 20(1), 117–127.
- Mehta, R., & Aguilera, E. (2020). A critical approach to humanizing pedagogies in online teaching and learning. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 37(3), 109–120.
- Meyer, K. A., & Murrell, V. S. (2014). A national survey of faculty development evaluation outcome measures and procedures. *Online Learning*, 18(3), 1–18.
- Mohammed, A. O., Khidhir, B. A., Nazeer, A., & Vijayan, V. J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching during coronavirus pandemic: The current trend and future directive at Middle East College Oman.

- Innovative Infrastructure Solutions*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-020-00326-7>
- Moore, M. G. (1993). Theory of transactional distance. In D. Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical principles of distance education* (pp. 22–38). Routledge.
- Moorhouse, B. L., & Tiet, M. C. (2021). Attempting to implement a pedagogy of care during the disruptions to teacher education caused by COVID-19: A collaborative self-study. *Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 17(2), 208–227. <https://doi-org.10.1080/17425964.2021.1925644>
- Nieveen, N., & Folmer, E. (2013). Formative evaluation in educational design research. *Design Research*, 153(1), 152-169. <educational-design-research-part-a.pdf> (unpatti.ac.id)
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. University of California Press.
- Noddings, N. (2010). *Moral Education and Caring*. *Theory and Research in Education* 8 (2): 145–151. doi:10.1177/ 1477878510368617.
- Noddings, N. (2012a). *Philosophy of Education*. Westview Press.
- Noddings, N. (2012b). *The caring relation in teaching*. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(6), 771– 781. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42001791>
- Nomnian, S. (2022). Emergency remote teaching and learning in a language and intercultural communication program during the “new normal” in Thai higher education. *Journal of Language & Linguistics Studies*, 18, 108–126.
- Palvia, S., Aeron, P., Gupta, P., Mahapatra, D., Parida, R., Rosner, R., & Sindhi, S. (2018). Online education: Worldwide status, challenges, trends, and implications. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, 21(4), 233–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1097198X.2018.1542262>

- Pate, C. (2020). *Self-care strategies for educators during the coronavirus crisis: Supporting personal social and emotional well-being*. WestEd. <https://www.wested.org/resources/self-care-strategies-for-educators-covid-19>
- Pedro, N. S., & Kumar, S. (2020). Institutional Support for Online Teaching in Quality Assurance Frameworks. *Online Learning Journal [OLJ]*, 24(3), 50+. https://link-gale-com.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu/apps/doc/A636551321/AONE?u=viva_vpi&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=a7b7fb31
- Picciano, A. G. (2017). Theories and frameworks for online education: Seeking an integrated model. *Online Learning*, 21(3), 166–190. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu/10.24059/olj.v21i3.1225>
- Pollard, R., & Kumar, S. (2021). Instructional designers in Higher education: Roles, challenges, and supports. *The Journal of Applied Instructional Design*, 11(1). <https://dx.doi.org/10.51869/111/rp>
- Qiu, J., Shen, B., Zhao, M., Wang, Z., Xie, B., & Xu, Y. (2020). A nationwide survey of psychological distress among Chinese people in the COVID-19 epidemic: Implications and policy recommendations. *General Psychiatry*, 33(2).
- Rabin, C. (2021). Care ethics in online teaching. *Journal of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices*, 17(1), 38–56. <https://doi-org.10.1080/17425964.2021.1902801>
- Rausch, M., Flood, L., Moreno, R., Kluge, S., & Takahashi, A. (2022). Emergency support for faculty: Adherence to best practices in designing, developing, and implementing virtual training during a pandemic. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 19(2), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.19.2.3>
- Redstone, A., & Luo, T. (2021). Exploring faculty perceptions of professional development support for transitioning to emergency remote teaching. *The Journal of Applied Instructional Design*, 10(2), 127-144. <https://doi.org/10.51869/102/ar>

- Reilly, J. R., Vandenhouten, C., Gallagher-Lepak, S., & Ralston-Berg, P. (2012). Faculty development for E-Learning: A multi-campus community of practice (Cop) approach. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 16(2), 99–110. <https://doi-org.10.24059/olj.v16i2.249>
- Richey, R. C., & Seels, B. (1994). Defining a field: A case study of the development of the 1994 definition of instructional technology. In D. P. Ely (Ed.), *Educational media and technology yearbook Vol. 20*, (pp.2-17). Libraries Unlimited.
- Richey, R. C., Klein, J. D., & Nelson, W. A. (2004). Developmental research studies of instructional design and development. In D. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (1099-1123). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Richey, R. C., Klein, J. D., & Tracey, M. W. (2011). *The instructional design knowledge base: Theory, research, and practice*. Routledge.
- Richey, R., & Klein, J. D. (2007). *Design and development research: Methods, strategies, and issues*. L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Robinson, H. A., Kilgore, W., & Warren, S. J. (2017). Care, communication, learner support: Designing meaningful online collaborative learning. *Online Learning*, 21(4), 29–51.
- Robinson, H., Kilgore, W., & Al-Freih, M. (2020). Designing with care: Towards a care-centered model for online learning design. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 37(3), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-10-2019-0098>
- Rogers, D., & Webb, J. (1991). The ethic of caring in teacher education, *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(3), 173-181.
- Ross, A. F., & DiSalvo, M. L. (2020). Negotiating displacement, regaining community: The Harvard Language Center's response to the COVID-19 crisis. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(2), 371–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12463>

- Rubtsova, A., Semenova, N., Kats, N., & Zheleznyakova, O. (2023). Instructional framework for emergency remote teaching in Higher Education. *Education Sciences*, 13(6), 613.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060613>
- Sedlacek, Q. C., Amador, L., Beasley, E., Malech, K., Vigil, V., Haeger, H., Gray, C. V., Slown, C. D. (2023). Two stories to tell: Racial equity and the impact of different instructor adaptations to COVID-19. *Online Learning*, 27(3), 271-296. DOI: 10.24059/olj.v27i3.3214
- Sharoff, L. (2019). Creative and innovative online teaching strategies: Facilitation for active participation. *Journal of Educators Online*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.9743/JEO.2019.16.2.9>
- Simonson, M., Zvacek, S., & Smaldino, S. (2019). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education*. (7th ed.). Information Age Publishing.
- Singleton, K., Evmenova, A., Jerome, M. K., & Clark, K. (2019). Integrating UDL strategies into the Online course development process: Instructional designers' perspectives. *Online Learning*, 23(1), 206–235. <https://doi-org.10.24059/olj.v23i1.1407>
- Sitzman, K., & Leners, D. W. (2006). Student perceptions of caring in online baccalaureate education. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 27(5), 254–259. <https://insights.ovid.com/pubmed?pmid=17036683>
- Slimi, Z. (2020). Online learning and teaching during COVID-19: A case study from Oman. *International Journal of Information Technology and Language Studies*, 4(2).
- Smidt, E., McDyre, B., Bunk, J., Li, R., & Gatenby, T. (2014), Faculty attitudes about distance education, *IAFOR Journal of Education*. 1(2), 181–210.
- Stewart, W. H. (2021). A global crash-course in teaching and learning online: A thematic review of empirical emergency remote teaching (ERT) studies in higher education during Year 1 of COVID-19. *Open Praxis*, 13, 89–102. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.13.1.1177>

- Stewart, W. H., Baek, Y., & Lowenthal, P. R. (2022). From emergency remote teaching (ERT) to sustained remote teaching (SRT): A comparative semester analysis of exchange students' experiences and perceptions of learning online during COVID-19. *Online Learning, 26*(2), 170–197. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v26i2.2661>
- Strachan, S. L. (2020). The case for the caring instructor. *College Teaching, 68*(2), 53–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2019.1711011>
- The U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2019. *Building cultures of preparedness: A report for the emergency management higher education community*. Washington, DC: FEMA.
- Tolika, M., Karapiperis, D., Tsirikas, A., & Verykios, V. (2022). Social participation through sports: Discourse analysis through innovative teaching techniques. *Open Education: The Journal for Open & Distance Education & Educational Technology, 18*(2), 7–17.
- Truong, T., & Murray, J. (2019). Understanding language teacher motivation in online professional development: A study of Vietnamese EFL teachers. *TESL-EJ, 23*(3), 1.
- Tyers, D., & Sillito, J. (2018). Locating continuing professional development within a proposed complex dynamic systems model for today's English language teaching profession. *TESL Canada Journal, 35*(2), 179–193.
- Velasquez, A., Graham, C. R., & Osguthorpe, R. D. (2013). Caring in a technology-mediated online high school context. *Distance Education, 34*(1), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.770435>
- Verbruggen, M., & Sels, L. (2008). Can career self-directedness be improved through counseling? *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*(2), 318–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.07.001>
- Viberg, O., Bälter, O., Hedin, B., Riese, E., & Mavroudi, A. (2019). Faculty pedagogical developers as enablers of technology enhanced learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 50*(5), 2637–2650.

- Walsh, L. L., Arango-Caro, S., Wester, E. R., & Callis-Duehl, K. (2021). Training faculty as an institutional response to covid-19 emergency remote teaching supported by data. *CBE - Life Sciences Education, 20*(3).
- Whittle, C., Tiwari, S., Yan, S., & Williams, J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching environment: A conceptual framework for responsive online teaching in crises. *Information and Learning Sciences, 121*, 311–319. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-04-2020-0099>
- Williamson, B., Eynon, R., & Potter, J. (2020). Pandemic politics, pedagogies, and practices: Digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency. *Learning, Media, and Technology, 45*, 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1761641>
- Willoughby, M., Gómez, H. G., & Lozano, M. Á. F. (2010). Making e-government attractive. *Service Business, 4*, 49-62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11628-009-0083-5>
- Xie, J., A, G., & Rice, M. F. (2021). Instructional designers' roles in emergency remote teaching during COVID-19. *Distance Education, 42*(1), 70–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1869526>
- Yan Dang, M. & Yulei Gavin Zhang. (2021). Examining gender differences in student learning during the covid-19 pandemic: A model from the switching costs and quality related perspectives. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research, 20*, 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4881>
- Yapar, O.E., & Dayananda, C.S. (2022). Teacher training for online education in Oman: A case study at two English language teaching institutions. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) 2nd Special Issue on Covid 19 Challenges, (2)*, 411- 425. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awe/covid2.27>
- Yeo, J., Li, H., Shin, Y. A., & Haupt, B. (2017). Cultural approach to crisis management. In, A. Farazmand (Ed.), *Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance*. Springer. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.vt.edu/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_794-1
- Zhai, Y., & Du, X. (2020). Addressing collegiate mental health amid COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychiatry Research, 288*.

Zuo, X., & Ives, D. (2022). Student experiences and equity during emergency remote teaching in U.S.

Higher Institutions: A Literature Review. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Dergisi*, Special Issue, 115-

135. DOI: 10.52597/buje.1053118

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A RESEARCH STRATEGY & SELECTION FROM THE LITERATURE

In this section of the methodology, the method developed for this specific search strategy is described based on Bramer's et al., (2018) exhaustive search guide. Although this guide has been created for systematic review searchers, it is still very useful and effective to be used by traditional literature review searchers due to the similarity of the two reviews and processes. For this current study, the Bramer's et al., (2018) exhaustive search guide will be applied throughout the search strategy and selection from the literature. However, if one step has not been completely carried out, a justification will be offered for not doing so. These steps have been thoroughly executed and carried out in the details below.

Step	DETAILS
1	In the problem identification stage, establish a clearly well-defined research question to answer the research problem. For this model development research, the question reads as "What guidelines could be recommended to integrate care pedagogy for faculty professional development and training to optimize their experience within any ERT setting?"
2	Describe the articles that best fit and can answer the research stated question. A selection of seminal and relevant articles should be taken into consideration for this step.
3	Decide key concepts that speak to the different elements of the question. For example, my research question is "What are the guidelines needed to integrate care pedagogy for faculty professional development and training to optimize their experience within any ERT setting?"
4	Out of these main research question elements, my key concepts are: "integrate", "care pedagogy", "faculty", and "develop or train", and "ERT". This step has been performed with some assistance from a senior evidence synthesis librarian to ensure that best practices are applied. Then key concepts were grouped to create elements in the search strategy. This step was performed using the reference of the Population Intervention Comparison Outcomes (PICO) framework to guide the process. To put it clearly, the target Population here is faculty, Intervention is their development and training to integrate care pedagogy, and the Outcomes are effective ERT outcomes.

Decide which elements should be utilized for the best results. It is worth mentioning here that not all question elements are necessary to be included in the search; some of the elements are less important or unimportant such as “guidelines”, “needed”, “professional”, “optimize”, “their experience”, and “setting”. Hence, it was recommended that the number of elements should remain as low as possible to optimize search outcomes. The rule is that elements should be from the most important and specific to the more general and less important. To give specific examples, I decided to focus on five concepts taken from my research question in Step 3. These are “integrate”, with all its related synonyms (natural vocabulary), “care pedagogy”, “faculty” along its all-relevant synonyms (natural vocabulary), and “train” or “develop” with their associated synonyms (natural vocabulary), and “emergency remote teaching (ERT)” including its all-relevant synonyms (natural vocabulary).

- 5 Choose an appropriate database and interface to start with coverage and presence of a thesaurus. For this step, I decided to land on three different databases: Education Research Complete (ERC) and Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) from EBSCOHost interface, and Scopus from Scopus interface after the researcher consulted with a senior online and graduate engagement librarian. For the thesaurus feature, the researcher decided not to use it in ERC and ERIC because the thesaurus feature offered me controlled vocabulary that are irrelevant and unimportant. In addition, these controlled vocabularies have completely different meanings in their own context if used, they are going to change the search focus and scope. For Scopus, this feature was not available, or it was not required. See Step 7 for more details and information.
- 6 Document the search process in a text document. This step has been done in a MS word document. It has gone through many revisions and iterations.
- 7 Identify appropriate index terms in the thesaurus of the first database for the preferred elements. “If no relevant thesaurus terms have been found for an element, free-text terms can be used” (p.534).
- 8 Identify synonyms in the thesaurus. As I mentioned in Step 7, this step was skipped because relevant thesaurus terms could be found in Education Research complete and ERIC. However, some synonyms have been identified as natural terms. They exist as a string in the three concepts.
- 9 Add variations in search terms such as truncation, spelling differences, abbreviations, and opposites. For my specific search strategy, the truncation feature has been applied where the ending letter of a word is dropped and replaced with an asterisk (*). To state examples, “Intermingle” has been truncated as “Intermingl*” to capture other related words such as “Intermingling”, “Emergency” truncated as “Emergenc*” to capture “Emergency” and “Emergencies”, “Care” has been truncated as “Car*” to capture “Care” and “Caring”. This has been executed with most of the search terms where it has been seen fit. More examples of this are further illustrated in Tables 5 and 6 (See below pp.131-132).

- 10 Use database appropriate syntax parentheses, Boolean operators, and field codes. For this step, to ensure comprehensiveness, syntax parentheses, Boolean Operators “OR” between the search terms and “AND” have been applied when combining multiple searches. The senior evidence synthesis professional advised me not to use the “NOT” operator to ensure inclusiveness and comprehensiveness in the search outcomes. Also, on the Scopus platform, the information specialist advised me not to use the curly square parentheses “{}” required by the database again for the same purpose which is to guarantee applying best practices and getting comprehensive search yields. In the same vein, the senior evidence synthesis professional, also, recommended not to use the “limiters” or sometimes “filters” (e.g., material or source type, full-text, peer-reviewed articles only, language, publisher and many more) offered by the databases to ensure rigor and comprehensiveness.
- 11 Optimize the search. This step will be performed by combining multiple searches, for example by first searching for each concept separately and then combining the searchers S1 AND S2 AND S3 together.
- 12 Evaluate the initial results. See the number of search results and the types of articles and their relevancy. This step has been executed with revisions and iterations several times after multiple exchanges of feedback and comments from the senior evidence synthesis specialist.
- 13 Check for errors. Again, this step has been carried out after a consultation with the senior evidence synthesis specialist like checking for spelling or any missing syntax such as the Boolean operator “OR” or truncation (*) or the double quotations (“”) and spacing between the concepts.
- 14 Translate to other databases. Use the exact search strategy across all databases with some considerations given to the sensitive and specific nature of each database interface (Bramer et al., 2018).
- 15 Test and reiterate. This step will need to be performed many times.

Table 5 Search terms used in the search strategy utilizing Boolean, Proximity, and Truncation Operators in EBSCOhost

Interface	EBSCOHost Research
Database	Education Research Complete & ERIC
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	"Integrat*" OR "Combin*" OR "Amalgamat*" OR "Merg*" OR "Unit*" OR "Join*" OR "Fus*" OR "Blend*", "Mingl*" OR "Coalesc*" OR "Consolidat*" OR "Meld*" OR "Intermingl*" OR "Mix*" OR "Intermix*" OR "Incorporat*"
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	"Car* Pedagog*" OR "Nurtur*" OR "Scaffold*" OR "Support*" OR "Rapport*" OR "Trust*"
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	"Faculty" OR "College Instructor*" OR "University Instructor*" OR "College Teacher*"
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	OR "University teacher*" OR "Professor*"
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	"Resourc*" OR "Support*" OR "Train*" OR "Develop*" OR "Coach*" OR "Instruct*" OR "Teach*" OR "Tutor*" OR "Upskill*" OR "Prepar*" OR "Guid*" OR "Educat*"
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	"Emergenc*" OR "Urgent*" OR "Crises*" OR "Disaster*" OR "Sudden*" OR "Abrupt*" OR "Quick" OR "Swift*"
In Title, Keyword, Abstract	"Online Teach*" OR "Online Instruct*" OR "Online Learn*" OR "Online Educat*" OR "Remote Teach*" OR "Remote Instruct*" OR "Remote Learn*" OR "Remote Educat*" OR "Asynchronous* Teach*" OR "Asynchronous* Instruct*" OR "Asynchronous* Learn*" OR "Asynchronous* Educat*" OR "Virtual* Teach*" OR "Virtual* Instruct*" OR "Virtual* Learn*" OR "Virtual* Educat*" OR "Distance Teach*" OR "Distance Instruct*" OR "Distance Learn*" OR "Distance Educat*" OR "Remote Environment*" OR "Remote Educat*"

Table 6 *Terms used in the search strategy utilizing Boolean, Proximity, and Truncation Operators in Scopus*

Interface	Scopus
Database	Scopus
Article title, Abstract, Keywords	"Integrat*" OR "Combin*" OR "Amalgamat*" OR "Merg*" OR "Unit*" OR "Join*" OR "Fus*" OR "Blend*", "Mingl*" OR "Coalesc*" OR "Consolidat*" OR "Meld*" OR "Intermingl*" OR "Mix*" OR "Intermix*" OR "Incorporat*
Article title, Abstract, Keywords	"Car*" "Pedagog*" OR "Nurtur*" OR "Scaffold*" OR "Support*" OR "Rappport*" OR "Trust"
Article title, Abstract, Keywords	"Faculty" OR "College Instructor*" OR "University Instructor*" OR "College Teacher*" OR "University teacher*" OR "Professor"
All fields	"Resourc*" OR "Support*" OR "Train*" OR "Develop*" OR "Coach*" OR "Instruct*" OR "Teach*" OR "Tutor*" OR "Upskill*" OR "Prepar*" OR "Guid*" OR "Educat"
Article title, Abstract, Keywords	"Emergenc*" OR "Urgent*" OR "Crises*" OR "Disaster*" OR "Sudden*" OR "Abrupt*" OR "Quick" OR "Swift"
Article title, Abstract, Keywords	"Online Teach*" OR "Online Instruct*" OR "Online Learn*" OR "Online Educat*" OR "Remote Teach*" OR "Remote Instruct*" OR "Remote Learn*" OR "Remote Educat*" OR "Asynchronous* Teach*" OR "Asynchronous* Instruct*" OR "Asynchronous* Learn*" OR "Asynchronous* Educat*" OR "Virtual* Teach*" OR "Virtual* Instruct*" OR "Virtual* Learn*" OR "Virtual* Educat*" OR "Distance Teach*" OR "Distance Instruct*" OR "Distance Learn*" OR "Distance Educat*" OR "Remote Environment*" OR " Remote Educat"

APPENDIX B IRB APPROVAL LETTER



300 Turner Street NW Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 540/231-3732
irb@vt.edu <http://www.research.vt.edu/sirc/hrpp>

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 5, 2024
TO: Glen A Holmes, Kamla Sulaiman Al Amri
FROM: Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (FWA00000572)
PROTOCOL TITLE: Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for
 Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education
IRB NUMBER: 24-250

Effective April 24, 2024, the Virginia Tech Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) determined that this protocol meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review under 45 CFR 46.104(d) category (ies) 2(i).i

Ongoing IRB review and approval by this organization is not required. This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these activities impact the exempt determination, please submit an amendment to the HRPP for a determination.

This exempt determination does not apply to any collaborating institution(s). The Virginia Tech HRPP and IRB cannot provide an exemption that overrides the jurisdiction of a local IRB or other institutional mechanism for determining exemptions.

All investigators (listed above) are required to comply with the researcher requirements outlined at:

<https://secure.research.vt.edu/external/irb/responsibilities.htm>

Please review responsibilities before beginning your research.

PROTOCOL INFORMATION:

Determined As: **Exempt, under 45 CFR 46.104(d) category(ies) 2(ii)**
 Protocol Determination Date: **April 24, 2024**

ASSOCIATED FUNDING:

The table on the following page indicates whether grant proposals are related to this protocol.

APPENDIX C INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Title of the Study: Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education

Investigator's Name: Kamla Al Amri

Email: kamlaa@vt.edu

Research Advisor: Dr. Glen Holmes

Email: gholmes@vt.edu

1 Purpose of the Study

Motivated by the worldwide upheaval generated by the pandemic, this design and development research study endeavors to design a faculty development and training agenda tailored for faculty within any future ERT context. It proposes strategies, considerations, and guidelines to prepare faculty to integrate care pedagogy into their online instruction and delivery, and to optimize their experience when faced with future ERT situations.

As previously mentioned, COVID-19 is the driving force behind this faculty development plan. This study is an early attempt to investigate faculty development post-COVID-19. The researcher was prompted to conduct this study due to one major reason. Namely, the researcher believes that ERT provides a unique experience for faculty to deal with online teaching environments. This is especially true since systematic digital online delivery is lacking in some areas around the world prior to COVID-19 (Abdulsattar et al., 2021; Al Harthy & Al Ani, 2023; Al-Naabi & Al Abri, 2021; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Slimi, 2020).

In closing, the current study seeks to address and investigate the integration of care-informed pedagogy into faculty development for ERT settings. In today's post-pandemic world, higher education instructors need effective and care-full faculty development frameworks. These frameworks will guide faculty to boost their students' motivation, engagement, retention, and optimize their achievement of learning outcomes.

2 Rationale for the Study

The rapid pivot to emergency remote teaching in response to the COVID-19 pandemic posed substantial challenges to higher education institutions nationwide. As a result of this, faculty members and instructors were assigned the task of adapting their teaching methods to online delivery and remote online environments; this was often done with time constraints and little to no training (Al-Naabi & Al Abri 2021; Covelli & Roy, 2022; Hebert et al., 2022; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Mohammed et al., 2020; Slimi, 2020). The concept of care-informed pedagogy has since emerged as a foundational framework to address the online education and ERT-associated challenges (Bozkurt et al., 2020; Karakaya, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).

This rationale outlines key justification for conducting the present study, centering on integrating care pedagogy into ERT faculty development for higher education settings. First and foremost, in the ERT context, students face isolation, stress, anxiety, and other challenging circumstances (Al Sulaimi, 2022; Maican & Cocoradă, 2021; Qiu et al., 2020; Zhai & Du, 2020). Therefore, the care pedagogy framework will be presented and introduced in order to meet students' emotional and psychological needs. This care-focused faculty development design may help to mitigate negative consequences or emotions (e.g., stress, anxiety, isolation, & fear) resulting from a sudden shift to online teaching or remote teaching environments.

Second, as mentioned earlier, emergency remote teaching involves a quick and sudden shift to an online modality in response to an emergency and does not have to be related to a pandemic only. It may occur in response to any natural disaster (e.g., floods, earthquakes, cyclones, and wars). Implementing a flexible and caring pedagogy during ERT is a quick solution and effective strategy to ensure continuity of education and students' success (Hodges et al., 2020).

Third, because faculty are the carriers of knowledge who facilitate learning, their competence directly impacts the quality of online education delivered to students in remote environments. Thus, incorporating the care pedagogy in their development and preparedness is extremely important in order to equip them with the skills and knowledge to deliver efficient ERT and maximize learning outcomes (Burke & Larmar, 2020; Bunker, 2021; Robinson et al., 2020).

Fourth, care-oriented pedagogies help to foster students' well-being and promote motivation, engagement, and retention (Al Sulaimi, 2022; Bunker, 2021; Zuo & Ives, 2022). Finally, by integrating care pedagogy into faculty development for ERT, faculty develop competencies that can be extended to any online teaching environment including those outside the ERT context. This is true for higher education institutions that do not follow a formalized online teaching delivery system within their educational landscape (Al-Naabi & Al Abri 2021; Covelli & Roy, 2022; Hebert et al., 2022; Magd & Jonathan, 2023; Mohammed et al., 2020; Slimi, 2020).

Above all, while care-informed pedagogy has received significant attention in the educational field, there has been a dearth of literature investigating its implementation in faculty development for the ERT context (Al Sulaimi, 2022; Bunker, 2021; Burke & Larmar, 2020; Robinson et al., 2020). In closing, the present study seeks to contribute to the growing body of FD in ERT literature. It emphasizes and underscores the importance of placing students' well-being, safety, and comfort at the forefront of pedagogical practices.

3 How the findings will be used

The results and findings of this Type 2 model research will be used solely for academic purposes. Above all, the findings will be used to create effective guidelines that could be used to guide faculty into integrating care pedagogy into their teaching practices for any future emergency remote teaching. The findings also will be used to disseminate and share knowledge in different formats such as publishing an article in a peer-reviewed journal or presenting it as a poster or conference paper.

4 Eligibility

The expert reviewers participating in this research are qualified and possess the expertise necessary to take part in the study. Reviewers must have at least ten years of experience in one or more of the following areas: instructional design, online teaching, online learning, educational technology, faculty development, emergency remote teaching, or care pedagogy. In addition, expert reviewers should be currently employed at Virginia Tech or another reputable university in the United States or abroad.

5 Procedures

Participants will be recruited by sending them an invitation letter via the VT email system. All study-related materials will be sent to the expert reviewers using the researcher's vt.edu email account. After the invitation letters are sent and consent is obtained, the reviewers will receive another email containing all the research documents. The expert reviewers should be able to access all study documents (Informed consent Form, guidelines and strategies document, and the *QuestionPro* Survey link) in one place, via VT email.

6 Time commitment

The review process of the study proposal and the questionnaire should take about two hours or less to complete. As a participant, you will have a two-week window to complete the questionnaire.

7 Risks

The investigators are not aware of any risks associated with participation in this study, and there should be no risks or harm involved in taking part.

8 Benefits

There are no direct benefits for the participants except that your name is going to be acknowledged and mentioned as expert reviewer in the study. However, the study might provide benefits for faculty, instructional designers, policymakers, and faculty developers on how to integrate care pedagogy into faculty development for any future emergency remote teaching.

9 Anonymity & confidentiality

The researcher will ensure that all information shared by you (the participant) is kept anonymous and confidential. It will not be shared, except for academic purposes or knowledge dissemination.

10 Compensation

There will be no compensation for participating in this study.

11 Freedom to Withdraw

You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to provide a justification.

12 Participants Responsibilities

As an expert reviewer, you will be asked to respond to a *QuestionPro* survey sent to you via email. First, you will need to give your consent to participate in the study. Second, you should proceed by answering the survey questions and providing feedback on the proposed guidelines and strategies. In addition, you can offer suggestions and recommendations for future improvements.

13 Participants' consent

You will be asked to show your consent at the very beginning of the *QuestionPro* survey (Web-based questionnaire) before you proceed to the survey questions.

14 Questions or concerns

If you have any questions about this study, you can contact the research investigator: Kamla Al Amri at kamlaa@vt.edu or the faculty advisor: Dr. Glen Holmes at gholmes@vt.edu. If you also have any queries or concerns about how this study is conducted or about your rights as a participant, or if you need to report research associated inquiry or concern, you can contact Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board Phone: 5402313732, email: irb@vt.edu.

APPENDIX D
EXPERT REVIEWER RECRUITMENT INVITATION LETTER

School of Education Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060 USA

Subject: Invitation to evaluate and provide feedback on guidelines created to develop faculty to integrate care pedagogy for future emergency remote teaching in Higher education.

Dear Dr. (Name of SME),

This is Kamla Al Amri, a fifth year PhD candidate at the Instructional Design and Technology Department, School of Education at Virginia Tech. I am reaching out to invite you to participate as an expert reviewer in the study entitled:

Guidelines for Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education: The CARE Framework

The purpose of the study is to address and investigate the integration of care-informed pedagogy into faculty development for ERT settings. In today's post-pandemic world, higher education instructors need effective and care-full faculty development frameworks. These frameworks will guide future faculty to boost their students' motivation, engagement, retention, and optimize their achievement of learning outcomes.

I am certain that your expertise and experience in one or more of the fields of instructional design and technology, professional & faculty development, online teaching, and care pedagogy will benefit me immensely. Also, your valuable feedback and comments will improve the initial guidelines I created for faculty to teach online during any emergency remote situation. Should you accept this invitation, a website with all the study resources will be sent to you.

Please be reminded that you have two weeks to complete the questionnaire. The whole review process should not take you more than approximately two hours or less in total.

I thank you in advance for your willingness to help. Sincerely,

Kamla Al Amri

APPENDIX E EMAIL REMINDER

Participating As an Expert Reviewer

Dear Dr. (Name of SME),

I hope this message finds you well. Thank you for your willingness to partake in this study entitled:

Integrating Care Pedagogy into Faculty Development for Future Emergency Remote Teaching (ERT) in Higher Education

Attached to this email, you will find three documents and a link. These are as follows:

1. Informed Consent Document
2. Guidelines and Strategies document (Chapter 4)
3. Survey in an MS Word document (For you to familiarize yourself with the Question type)
4. QuestionPro Survey Link: <https://virginiatech.QuestionPro.com/KamlaAlamri>

You can start by reading the Informed Consent Document. Before you take the survey, I urge you to read the guidelines and strategies document first. Also, you can familiarize yourself with the question items in the MS Word document provided. The guidelines and strategies are provided for you in the QuestionPro survey for ease and convenience. You can take the survey at different sessions. There is an option where you can save your responses and come later.

You are granted a timeframe of two weeks to complete the review process. I would appreciate it if you could complete the survey by June 3, 2024. I believe your feedback and suggestions on the guidelines design would contribute to making them meet a high standard of excellence.

If you come across any challenges or issues, you can contact me at kamlaa@vt.edu. Can you please confirm receipt of this email?

I look forward to your expertise and insights.

Thank you in advance for your help and support. My best regards,

Kamla

APPENDIX F

EXPERT REVIEWER QUESTIONNAIRE

Participating As an Expert Reviewer

School of Education Instructional Design & Technology
Virginia Tech

Section One: Introduction

Dear Expert reviewers,

This questionnaire has been thoroughly devised to capture your expert insights, experiences, and perspectives on the caring components within education during emergency remote teaching. Your responses and feedback will play an influential role in shaping and determining the creation of actionable guidelines aimed at developing faculty and educators' capacity to model care in their teaching practices and behaviors. Also, your expertise and reflections will assist in creating a caring online environment for learners at any emergency remote teaching.

Please provide as much feedback as you can and feel free to direct any questions or concerns to Kamla Al Amri, Ph.D. candidate at Virginia Tech at kamlaa@vt.ed any time throughout the review process. Your feedback, insights and suggestions are highly appreciated. Thank you for your time and willingness to help.

Before you decide to participate, it is significant to understand why this research is being conducted and what it entails. Please take time to read the information provided in the Consent Form carefully.

Please note the term "effective" has been used across the survey question items to describe whether guidelines are "effective". A definition of the word "effective" has been included to maintain consistency. According to Merriam Webster online dictionary, "Effective" means "producing a decided and, decisive, or desired effect".

Section Two: Consent Statement		
1	I have read the Consent Form provided on the Website with all the study details. Also, I have all my inquiries responded to. Consent is indicated with submission of this online questionnaire. I hereby acknowledge and grant my voluntary consent.	Yes / No
2	I grant my approval for my name to be acknowledged in the methodology section of the dissertation.	Yes / No
3	If your response to Q 2. is YES, please provide your name here	<hr/>

Section Three: Participants' Demographic Information (Profile)		
	Please answer the following questions	
1	What is your highest educational qualification?	a. Master's degree b. Doctoral Degree
2	What are your years of experience as an educator?	a. 10 years b. 10-15 years c. 15-20 years d. More than 20 years
3	What is your gender?	a. Male b. Female c. Prefer Not to Disclose

Section Four: Proposed guidelines concerning the four caring elements (I. Modeling, II. Dialogue, III. Practice, & IV. Confirmation).

Theme (T)	Guideline(s) Proposed (G)	Question Did you find this guideline effective?	Please explain why you answered this way.
I. MODELING			
T.I.1 Approachability & Relatedness	G.I.1.1: Faculty should be approachable and relatable by offering different synchronous interaction opportunities for learners.	YES / NO	
T.I.2 Presence & Availability	G.I.2.1: Instructors should be available and present when needed.	YES / NO	
T.I.3 Deliberate Personalization	G.I.3.1: Faculty should follow personalized methods or techniques when dealing with learners in the ERT online space.	YES / NO	
T.I.4 Creating Interest & Intrigue	G.I.4.1: Faculty should be creative in creating interesting and engaging lesson plans.	YES / NO	
T.I.5 JEDI Framework	G.I.5.1: Faculty should consider the JEDI framework principles when teaching during ERT.	YES / NO	
T.I.6 Faculty readiness to teach online	G.I.6.1: Faculty readiness to teach online should be supported.	YES / NO	
T.I.7 Compassionate Flexibility	G.I.7.1: Faculty should employ compassionate flexibility in their online delivery and teaching practices.	YES / NO	
T.I.8 Accessibility	G.I.8.1: Faculty should advocate for accessibility whenever possible.	YES / NO	
T.I.9 Instructional Scaffolding	G.I.9.1: Faculty should demonstrate instructional scaffolding in the ERT space.	YES / NO	
T.I.10 Immediacy & Promptness	G.I.10.1: Faculty should be immediate and prompt in responding to students' questions and concerns.	YES / NO	
T.I.11 Technical Competence	G.I.11.1: Faculty should demonstrate technical competence to handle all technical challenges and issues that students might face.	YES / NO	
T.I.12 Institutional Support	G.I.12.1: Faculty should advise learners on self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and motivation.	YES / NO	

Theme (T)	Guideline(s) Proposed (G)	Question Did you find this guideline effective?	Please explain why you answered this way.
T.I.13 Simplicity & Cognitive Load Reduction	G.I.13.1: Faculty should practice simplicity and course load reduction.	YES / NO	
T.I.14: Self-care during time of crisis	G.I.14.1: Faculty should always exercise self-care, especially during times of crisis.	YES / NO	
Please provide additional suggestions, if any, to improve Modeling guidelines?			
II. DIALOGUE			
T.II.1 Personalization	G.II.1.1: Faculty should maintain students' privacy through personalized interactions and email correspondence.	YES / NO	
T.II.2 Timing/Promptness & Immediacy	G.II.2.1: Faculty should reply promptly to students' questions, inquiries, and concerns.	YES / NO	
T.II.3 JEDI Framework	G.II.3.1: Faculty should be mindful of JEDI (Justice, Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion) framework considerations in the ERT setting.	YES / NO	
T.II.4 Open Communication	G.II.4.1: Faculty should follow open and effective communication protocol.	YES / NO	
T.II.5 Approachability & Relatedness	G.II.5.1: Faculty should be approachable and relatable	YES / NO	
T.II.6 Accessibility	G.II.6.1: Faculty should be accessible to all learners.	YES / NO	
T.II.7 Rapport building	G.II.7.1: Faculty should build rapport among learners.	YES / NO	
T.II.8 Institutional support/PD	G.II.8.1: Faculty should enhance learners self-directed learning, self-regulation, and self-efficacy through chats and conversations with students.	YES / NO	
T.II.9 Instructional Scaffolding	G.II.9.1: Faculty should offer instructional scaffolding.	YES / NO	
T.II.10 Presence, Availability & Community Building	G.II.10.1: Faculty should enhance presence (cognitive, social, & teaching) and community building.	YES / NO	
Please provide additional suggestions, if any, to improve Dialogue guidelines?			
III. PRACTICE			

Theme (T)	Guideline(s) Proposed (G)	Question Did you find this guideline effective?	Please explain why you answered this way.
T.III.1 Peer Mentoring	G.III.1.1: Faculty should assign a role of mentoring for online learners with their peers.	YES / NO	
T.III.2 Collaboration/Peer to Peer Support	G.III.2.1: Faculty should encourage their learners to support their peers and care for them.	YES / NO	
T.III.3 Social Presence & Community building	G.III.3.1: Faculty should enhance social presence and community building through group work activities and video conferencing.	YES / NO	
Please provide additional suggestions, if any, to improve Practicing guidelines?			
IV. CONFIRMATION			
T.IV.1 Personalization	G.IV.1.1: Faculty should personalize their feedback approaches when confirming their learners’ best behaviors and qualities.	YES / NO	
T.IV.2 Pacing	G.IV.2.1: Faculty should allow space between assignments and their grading.	YES / NO	
T.IV.3 Institutional support/PD	G.IV.3.1: Faculty should help learners enhance their online experience by covering topics such as self-directedness, self-regulation, and self-efficacy.	YES / NO	
Please provide additional suggestions, if any, to improve Confirmation guidelines.			

Section Five: The End of the survey

Thank you for your time, support, and contribution to this care-informed research endeavor. I look forward to getting your insights and incorporating them into the design of effective guidelines that could contribute to the growth of faculty development and their teaching praxes. Together, we can advance our collective understanding of care pedagogy in education generally and emergency remote teaching context, specifically.

APPENDIX G
EXPERT REVIEWERS' RESPONSES DATA SETS

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	1 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.1: Approachability & Relatedness	
Guideline	Guideline I.1.1: Faculty should be approachable and relatable by offering different synchronous interaction opportunities for learners.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I believe this is effective. These factors are concrete strategies for building rapport with students."
R2	Yes	Not Available
R3	Yes	"Yes, I do. Faculty should absolutely be doing these things". "Care is tricky, I think, at times though, when a faculty member has their own struggles." "However, I think it really only applies to full- time faculty, particularly as it relates to contact. I think it's a lot to ask a contingent or part-time faculty member to be available in many different ways."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	"Being approachable and relatable is not necessarily connected with synchronous learning." "You can do that through asynchronous interactions and elements such as storytelling, roleplaying, and avatars."
R6	No	"It seems the strategies are not explicit and clear."
P7	Yes	"They provide examples of how faculty can be approachable and relatable." However, the wording of S.I.1.b is confusing. I'm not 'offering multiplicity' is not typically used and I'm not sure if it is correct English. Does it mean offer multiple ways for students to contact you?"
P8	Yes	"These are different ideas, but all of them contribute to the learner's success."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	2 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.2: Presence & Availability	
Guideline	Guideline I.2.1: Instructors should be available and present when needed.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	<p>"These are all good examples of building presence and availability. I would only add one thing: having a clear point of contact with a real contact number or email address."</p> <p>"In my experience, students hate having a generic email address - they want to know who and how to contact - and that there's a real person behind the email."</p>
R2	Yes	Not Available
R3	Yes	<p>"I will reiterate that some of this is only applicable to full time faculty. If there is a larger crisis, availability and accessibility may be challenged."</p> <p>"The rest is absolutely uncontested although many of my colleagues seem to think that participating in DQs is optional."</p>
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	<p>"I think the term 'when needed' implies that the instructor should be available 'on demand.'</p> <p>"I think what is important that the instructor is available as needed, on a regular/weekly basis, and upon request of the student."</p>
R6	Yes	"Those strategies seem specific, actionable and manageable for an instructor."
R7	Yes	<p>"They are examples of the guideline. S.I.2.C is not worded correctly. it should be: Frequently touching base with the learners."</p> <p>"It's not clear to me how this guideline is different than the prior one about being approachable. It seems that there is a lot of overlap."</p>
R8	Yes	"They appear to work in different modalities, but all help the learner."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	3 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.3: Deliberate Personalization	
Guideline	Guideline.I.3.1: Faculty should follow personalized methods or techniques when dealing with learners in the ERT online space.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	<p>"Yes, but I would note that this is part of the challenge or skill involved in education."</p> <p>"The guidelines above are good, but educators need to be able to navigate this carefully - i.e. not being too familiar or too personal or revealing too much."</p> <p>"I often remember the line about 'Be friendly, but not their friend' when talking about students."</p>
R2	Yes	Not Available
R3	Yes	"Yes, mostly. I predominantly teach research methods and personal-level learning (S.I.3.c and d) can be challenging."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	<p>"These strategies help in the development of social presence, which is highly needed in online courses."</p> <p>"However, students should have the opportunity to choose how much they want to share or participate in activities that might be dealing with personal details."</p>
R6	No	"This set of strategies would work in normal situation. Regarding emergent situation, it seems more flexible and personalized strategies needed."
R7	No	<p>"It is pretty effective, but S.I.3.a is more than one strategy. There are several strategies in there. It seems that it should be divided up."</p> <p>"Also, I don't understand what 'providing personal networks' or 'reciprocal care' mean."</p> <p>"Again, it seems that these should be separated into more than one strategy in S.I.3.d."</p>
R8	Yes	"Again, different ideas, but they help"

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	4 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.4 Creating Interest & Intrigue	
Guideline	Guideline I.4.1: Faculty should be creative in creating interesting and engaging lesson plans.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, this one is almost a no-brainer." "It is not as simple as it sounds though - it requires an understanding of what students are interested in, for a start."
R2	Yes	Not Available
R3	Yes	"If you teach young people. If you are a graduate instructor, like myself, this can be challenging as they are adults and are focused on getting in and getting out, not on being entertained necessarily."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"I would reword the guideline as 'faculty should apply creativity in the development of interesting and engaging lesson plans.' "The guideline is effective because engaging content triggers interest in students."
R6	No	"This strategy does not seem specific to me, and it would be challenging to implement this strategy."
R7	Yes	"It is almost the same as the strategy, there is not really any difference."
R8	Yes	"I would remove the word young. This applies to all."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	5 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.5 JEDI (Justice, Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion) Framework	
Guideline	Guideline.I.5.1: Faculty should consider the JEDI framework principles when teaching during ERT.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"These make sense to me."
R2	Yes	<p>"These 19 strategies are all excellent, however there's a lot of repetition within the strategies and some of them seem to belong under different categories."</p> <p>"Also, some of the terminology may not be clear to everyone, especially those who are not fluent in DEI."</p> <p>"For example, S.I.5.d begins with a focus on highlighting students' interests (which is a form of personalization) and ends with 'offering options for learning representation' (what does that mean?"</p>
		<p>"Also, S.I.5.g, S.I.5.o, and S.I.5.p do not seem to be JEDI focused (5.o and 5.p seem to relate to the same thing)."</p> <p>"Regarding S.I.5.j, emotional intelligence isn't really JEDI, it's more of a personality/prior knowledge variable."</p> <p>"Also, S.I.5.m, S.I.5.n, and S.I.5.q seems to be belong to a more general strategy of being aware of technology related differentiated needs, which may involve gender, ability, or age related differences."</p> <p>"** There are 136 different strategies in your design, which is a huge number :), so categorizing these strategies is going to be a challenge. Your category names (e.g., Deliberate Personalization) are very good, sorting the strategies into these categories will never be perfect."</p> <p>"So, my comments are just to recommend taking another look at your strategy to category organization."</p>
R3	Yes	<p>"I mean I love all this, but I think we should be thoughtful about folx who teach a class of 100 students or teach a 4-4 load..."</p> <p>"this type of personal level pedagogy is extremely difficult. I also don't think it's faculty's job to serve as a student caretaker or therapist."</p> <p>Most aren't equipped to do some of this (for example, be mindful of cultural considerations) ..."</p> <p>"and I'm concerned that this then becomes very gendered...as in, women and non-binary faculty would be expected to do all this (and are anyway), but not our male counterparts."</p>
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"The JEDI framework can promote an inclusive environment extremely needed during ERT."
R6	Yes	"The strategies seem to build inclusive and accessible learning environment."
R7	Yes	<p>I think it is OK, but there are a lot of things in here."</p> <p>S.I.5.a is pretty vague. I'm not sure how I would do it." "The same is true for o and p, which seem to be the same. It would require more knowledge to do some of these like Q."</p> <p>" I don't know if I know tech-related gender differences."</p> <p>"For the guideline, I would have to know have access to the JEDI framework so I would understand it."</p>
R8	Yes	"All good ideas, but too many at once."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	6 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.6 Faculty's readiness to teach online	
Guideline	Guideline.I.6.1: Faculty readiness to teach online should be supported.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes. I agree with this one. I think that online teaching and learning is similar to face to face, but different enough that it requires some adaptation or new skill development."
R2	Yes	"This strategy just seems odd... it seems more related to convincing students that the faculty member is qualified to teach online, rather than establishing fostering faculty members readiness to teach online."
R3	Yes	"Lord yes. The mentality is typically, just throw us in and we'll figure it out. There should definitely be some assessment of this prior to having faculty teach in these environments and know how to create a positive online culture. I sure didn't at first. It took me years to figure this out on my own."
R4	No	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	"Many faculty and instructors are not ready to teach online or remotely during emergencies. However, online teaching is not the same as emergency remote teaching. I wonder if this guideline can create confusion and it should be renamed to focus on ERT."
R6	No	"This strategy is not specific enough and not actionable."
R7	No	"It don't understand what it means. I think it means that someone somehow needs to help students become ready to teach."
R8	No	"I don't think bragging about expertise is key."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	7 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.7. Compassionate Flexibility	
Guideline	Guideline.I.7.1: Faculty should employ compassionate flexibility in their online delivery and teaching practices	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	<p>"I try to remind faculty to think about the learners as humans first, students second."</p> <p>"This means being flexible and recognizing that the learning environment is only one small part of their lives."</p>
R2	Yes	<p>"Similar to the Jedi strategies, there is a lot here that overlap or may belong in a difference category. For example, the second strategy (due date flexibility) seems to be a specific form of the first strategy (removing time pressures)."</p> <p>"There also seems to be a need for a little bit more explanation related to what certain strategies mean. For example, what does 'Connecting a course with other content across disciplines' mean? How does this related to flexibility? Is this having the same assignment count for more than one class? Why is 'Showing students different roles and career opportunities pertinent to the course content and discipline' or 'Offering emotional support and asking students how they are doing' under flexibility?"</p> <p>"Some of these strategies are also likely to be not supported my a lot of faculty, for example, 'Being flexible and considerate to students by reducing the workload.' While compassion is good, a calculus I teacher is likely to say that students need to reach point X in the contact in order to be prepared for calculus II."</p> <p>"In a more general sense, any strategy that relates to content needs to be very carefully written. Faculty are not likely to take kindly to a set of guidelines telling them what they should be teaching. :-)"</p>
R3	No	<p>"I'm yes and no on this and think maybe these can be split up into separate guidelines."</p> <p>"If you teach in an accelerated program, you absolutely don't have time and space for many of these (those related to submission deadline)."</p> <p>"Also, there are institutional policies around grade input that are associated with federal regulations - they must be submitted by a certain time, so no, I'm not flexible on that because I can't be."</p> <p>"Also, effort isn't a grading criteria. That's ridiculous in my estimation. On the other hand, faculty should absolutely adapt in the face of crisis and assess students in different ways. Leaving an entire grade to an exam or a summative assessment is bad teaching, in my estimation."</p>
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"These guidelines promote a flexible and understanding environment needed during ERT."
R6	Yes	"These strategies seem to build flexibility in online delivery and teaching practices with actionable items."
R7	No	"I think this is the same as I.1.1 guideline."
R8	Yes	"Yes Again, so many ideas at once, that it is hard to judge."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	8 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.8. Accessibility	
Guideline	Guideline.I.8.1: Faculty should advocate for accessibility whenever possible.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, but I would have thought accessibility might have included more information about students with disabilities."
R2	Yes	"All of the strategies are good, however some of them don't seem to belong in the accessibility category." "Accessibility would seem to hi that these strategies will be related to the Individuals with Disabilities Act in some way. S.I.8.c, S.I.8.f, and S.I.8.g do not seem too. S.I.8.e and S.I.8.g are the same."
R3	Yes	"These make absolute sense. I'm a little on the fence about recording synchronous sessions for a couple of reasons: 1. mine are not required; 2. recording may prevent other learners from putting themselves out there."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"However, faculty should advocate for accessibility all the time. Accessibility is never optional."
R6	No	"The accessibility strategies primarily focus on access instead of digital accessibility practices and inclusive pedagogy."
R7	No	"I don't understand who they are advocating for. I think the wording may be confusing me. Maybe it should read: Faculty should make course materials accessible. Is that what is intended?"
R8	Yes	"Yes, good ideas here."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	9 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.9. Instructional Scaffolding	
Guideline	Guideline.I.9.1: Faculty should demonstrate instructional scaffolding in the ERT space.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I think these cover the main points."
R2	Yes	"The strategies are all good. It's unclear how S.I.9.a or b are related to scaffolding."
R3	Yes	"Except for the last one. Again, I work with adults and they chose an accelerated online program for convenience, so they have to figure it out quickly. I think it's the institution's responsibility to get them comfortable, not mine."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Scaffolding is an effective instructional strategy, so it would also be beneficial for students in ERT settings."
R6	No	"Instructional scaffolding strategies should be related to promoting learning through dialogue, feedback and shared responsibility in designing learning assignments, assessments, and activities."
R7	No	"It is not clear how this guideline is related to 9.a. I think that it does relate to several of the other strategies."
R8	Yes	"Yes, good ideas here."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	10 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.10. Immediacy & Promptness	
Guideline	Guideline.I.10.1: Faculty should be immediate and prompt in responding to students' questions and concerns.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes! Students often ask for help when they need it - so prompt responses are vital because it means the student can continue with their learning at that time - not having to wait a couple of days."
R2	Yes	"While I agree that both strategies are important, the first strategy seems to be a specific version of the second strategy. Also, the strategies seem to relate to either presence or personalization, so perhaps they could be moved there."
R3	Yes	"I can not agree with these more." "It's funny how so many of my colleagues though take a laissez faire approach to communication. It's another teaching/learning tool that they waste." "I have a colleague who tells students that they have to wait a week to get a return email - that's freaking crazy."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Providing timely feedback and responding on a timely fashion are must in online instruction and ERT."
R6	Yes	"The ground communication rules and expectations should be communicated and implemented through the semester." "It is important for instructors to be responsive in a timely manner, but also demonstrate it in health and professional manner as good role models to take care of their own well-beings."
R7	No	"This guideline is similar to one of the previous ones; I think it was the second or third one that was provided in this survey."
R8	Yes	"Yes, this is important."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	11 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.11. Technical Competence	
Guideline	Guideline.I.11.1: Faculty should demonstrate technical competence to handle all technical challenges and issues that students might face.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"This is a good idea - I think it relates to the regularity of some things within courses too." "Students like feeling like they're not 'lost' in online courses. These ideas help with that."
R2	Yes	"Some of the strategies relate to UDL recommendations. How are UDL and caring related? Should UDB a part of this somewhere?" "I recognize this is opening an entirely new can of worms ;-) so please feel free to ignore completely!"

R3	No	<p>“This is the university's responsibility. If they admit a student to an online program, then they should provide these resources.”</p> <p>“I have learning objectives that I have to get through in 6-8 weeks with adult students.”</p>
R4	Yes	“Logical and evidenced in research.”
R5	Yes	“I would add that faculty should ensure that they have sound professional development to obtain relevant and current technical competence.”
R6	Yes	“These strategies are important for faculty to demonstrate technical competence to handle all technical challenges and issues that might face students.”
R7	Yes	“I think it is pretty good, but I don't understand how 11.b is related to this guideline.”
R8	Yes	“Yes, this helps.”

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	12 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.12. Institutional Support	
Guideline	Guideline.I.12.1: Faculty should advise learners on self-directed learning, self-efficacy, and motivation.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, I think so, but I think that this will be challenging due to time constraints. Ideally this needs to be within courses, not an optional extra."
R2	Yes	"These strategies seem excessively broad and not the type of content or skills that should/could be delivered in most courses." "Should English 1001 and Intro Psych and 16th Century Poetry all be teaching about self-efficacy, agency, and video conferencing? How many teachers understand these topics enough to teach them?"
R3	Yes	"Yes, absolutely."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	"I don't see the connection between institutional support and the strategies. Are you referring to instructional and technical support?"
R6	Yes	"Good strategies"
R7	No	"This does not cover 12.b. I think 12.b fits in the prior guideline about technical skills."
R8	Yes	"Again. Helpful"

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	13 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.13. Simplicity & Cognitive Load Reduction	
Guideline	Guideline.I.13.1: Faculty should practice simplicity and course load reduction.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I especially like the notion of reducing the amount of assessment. I often think we over-assess."
R2	Yes	"These strategies are all good. I think this survey is causing high levels of extraneous cognitive load :-)" "As I read all of these strategies, it seems that perhaps there needs to be three levels to the organization: categories, general strategies, and specific strategies. Category: Cognitive Load Reduction General: Being mindful of cognitive load and being flexible to students by reducing the workload Specific: Chunking materials up into a few elements at a time."
R3	Yes	"Yes, a thousand times. But again, difficult in an accelerated program."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research"
R5	Yes	"Yes! Applying cognitivist strategies is certainly helpful to make sure learners master content."
R6	Yes	"Good and explicit strategies."
R7	No	"The wording 'practice simplicity' is too vague. It makes it sound like the course should be easy."
R8	No	"I like some of the ideas, but I don't feel it is necessary to drop assignments."

Care Element	I. Modeling	
Data Set No	14 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.I.14. Self-care during times of crisis	
Guideline	Guideline.I.14.1: Faculty should always exercise self-care, especially during times of crisis.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, but I think we need to be careful that self-care doesn't replace the responsibility of the educator to exercise a duty of care for students."
R2	Yes	"I agree with all of these strategies, but with most/all of the previous strategies focusing on the faculty demonstrating care for students, this seems weird that it's faculty self-care."
R3	Yes	"Yes. Especially for those who you advise or supervise in some way. You can't let those folks drift - you have to be present for them."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research"
R5	Yes	"During ERT, there is a personal component that should be addressed. This ensures that students can experience success and support."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies for exercising self-care"
R7	Yes	"I think so. It's pretty broad, so it covers most of these."
R8	No	"These are good ideas, but FERPA would restrict many outside of K-12 from talking to family."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	15 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.1 Personalization	
Guideline	Guideline.II.1.1: Faculty should maintain students' privacy through personalized interactions and email correspondence.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I often find that students have a preference for 1:1 interaction. I think this is important, but can be challenging with very large class sizes."
R2	Yes	<p>"Most of the strategies are good, although strategy S.II.1.d would be controversial."</p> <p>"The cameras 'on' versus cameras 'off' discussion seems to have two viable sides, the first side, having cameras 'on' provides greater social interaction and presence for students, and the second side, having cameras 'on' can violate students privacy and create issues for students who do not have Home environments they wish to share with others."</p> <p>"The category for this element, is similar to the previous 'deliberate personalization' element. This may get confusing."</p> <p>"Also the category 'Personalization' does not align with guideline.II.1: Faculty should maintain students privacy..."</p> <p>"Finally, it's unclear why this is in the Dialogue section and not to Modeling section."</p>
R3	Yes	"Yes, I think one on one is so important in the online environment and it should be considered as part of the experience (not just by faculty but also by ineffective LMS managers/instructional designers who think that the online course modules and assignments are the only way to account for time in the course)."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research"
R5	No	"I think some of the strategies contradict the guideline, especially S.II.1.b, and S.II.1.d."
R6	No	"Recommendation to add humanization strategies into this part."
R7	No	<p>"I don't understand how personalized interactions lead to privacy."</p> <p>"The strategies seem more related to faculty sharing about themselves and their personal lives. I don't understand how that is related to their privacy."</p>
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	16 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.2 Timing/Promptness & Immediacy	
Guideline	Guideline.II.2.1: Faculty should reply promptly to students' questions, inquiries, and concerns.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, I find the pre-assessment period to be particularly busy."
R2	Yes	"This seems to be a repeat of T.I.10."
R3	Yes	"I mean, it's the least we could do...I don't know why it's so hard for faculty to do this!"
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research".
R5	Yes	"I mean, it's the least we could do...I don't know why it's so hard for faculty to do this!"
R6	No	"Recommendation to add this : Clear communication expectations should be set up and communicated at the beginning of the semester."
R7	Yes	"Yes, however, this was covered with two other guidelines in the prior section." "This is redundant."
R8	Yes	"Good idea."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	17 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.3 JEDI Framework	
Guideline	Guideline.II.3.1: Faculty should be mindful of JEDI (Justice, Equity, Diversity, & Inclusion) framework considerations in the ERT setting.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"These guidelines fit nicely with the ideas about students as designers/contributors to course design."
R2	Yes	"These are all good strategies, however they seem to be all asking/stating the same thing". "It's also not clear how these are all JEDI related". "They could be, in that they provide students with a communication channel to share issues, concerns, ideas, and suggestions that could allow the teacher to better align the class with their specific needs, experiences, invoice, but all of these strategies or a bit more general did that. Just a thought."
R3	Yes	"We should always ask for students feedback on the course design...yet we only seek their opinions on their instructors (SETs) when we know that most instructors didn't actually design the freaking class they are teaching." "I very much want to add that most students are biased (there is evidence!) and are absolutely not equipped to give feedback on instruction". "So I have little trust here."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research".
R5	Yes	"The JEDI framework promotes an inclusive environment and welcomes students from different backgrounds and with different access to resources."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies about feedback."
R7	No	"The guideline is too broad and the strategies are more specific about allowing students to provide feedback." "This guideline was given before in the prior section for different strategies and those fit better than these."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	18 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.4 Open Communication	
Guideline	Guideline.II.4.1: Faculty should follow open and effective communication policy.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I like some of these ideas but I am cautious about the multiplicity of messaging systems. I think sometimes we 'lose' where the conversations are."
R2	Yes	"These are all good strategies, but there's an awful lot of overlap." "It may be that we've now processed through 60+ strategies, but a lot of these strategies are now feeling redundant." "Also, it seems that it would help to consider combining various strategies to reduce the overall number and save the poor readers cognitive load and mental energy:-)"
R3	Yes	"I'm a little yes and no on this. Tone is impossible in written communication, but sure, it doesn't hurt to be mindful of it." "I don't see the value of offering another communication application outside the LMS."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Open and effective communication develops a stronger instructor-learner relationship, which translates into better performance."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	Yes	"These seem to align pretty well."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	19 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.5 Approachability & Relatedness	
Guideline	Guideline.II.5.1: Faculty should be approachable and relatable.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Regular check ins are essential. I might be a bit out on a limb here, but I think discussion forums are vastly over-rated. They're often seen as a chore by students."
R2	Yes	<p>"These are all good strategies. Strategy S.II.5.b, check-ins, was already address in the Modeling section."</p> <p>"In reading through these strategies, while I have been asked to address 'why' I would find these strategies effective, there are far too many of them to focus on providing a reasonable explanation of 'why' for each one."</p> <p>"I also find myself wondering why the creator of this list thinks each strategy would be effective (I think they're all good, it would simply be nice to see the rationale for their inclusion)."</p> <p>"Finally, for each strategy there are a number of reasons why it may be effective, however, it's the implementation of each strategy that makes it effective, not the strategy itself. For example, consider the 'creating and moderating discussion forum' strategy. Depending on how this strategy is implemented, it may foster the development of deep meanings within students or it may provide an avenue for the sharing of racists, sexist, or agist stereotypes or even bullying (thus the need for moderating)."</p> <p>"As for reasons why, discussion forums may provide an opportunity for students to (a) process their understandings into a meaningful expression, (b) interact with understandings that are different from their own, (c) question the existence of particular social and cultural institutions, (d) engage in concept change by experiencing cognitive dissonance, (e) foster or modify schemas, (f) motivate deeper processing or critical thinking related to their prior knowledge, (g) develop self efficacy related to the topic based on personal accomplishment or peer persuasion, (h) test their knowledge and understand vicariously through vicarious reinforcement or punishment of others responses, (i) develop new and trusting relationships with peers and teachers through authenticity, logic, and empathy, etc. :-)"</p> <p>"Any and all of these rationales can be fostered or defeated by poor implementation. I bring all of this up, in part, because I'm not sure if I'm providing the needed feedback. :-"</p>
R3	Yes	"YES!"
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"In the first strategy, you are not talking about modalities, but about technologies."
R6	No	"The strategies do not seem to address relatedness in the teaching."
R7	No	<p>"Sort of. These strategies are more about using technology to access the instructor."</p> <p>"It doesn't mean that the instructor is relatable, only that there are different technologies to access them."</p>
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	20 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.6 Accessibility	
Guideline	Guideline.II.6.1: Faculty should be accessible to all learners.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"This is so important. I try to encourage instructors to get in early and leave late - or make the last 10 mins of class dedicated to this kind of unstructured conversation."
R2	Yes	"This strategy is also good, but is it modeling or dialogue, or both?"
R3	Yes	"Yes to the first part of that statement. Holding virtual office hours should be an absolute imperative in online learning...but again, I see so few faculty use this."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	"I don't think you are using the term 'accessibility' correctly here. You mean access to faculty."
R6	No	"Accessibility does not mean access."
R7	Yes	"It's only 1 strategy so it is simple."
R8	Yes	"Good idea"

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	21 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.7 Rapport building	
Guideline	Guideline.II.7.1: Faculty should build rapport among learners.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I agree with these."
R2	Yes	Not Available
R3	Yes	"I do all this. Humor is pretty subjective though, so faculty should use this very cautiously."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	"I'm not sure if you need to always use humor, friendliness, and bring the affective factor in ERT. ERT, and any kind of instruction, should always be professional first, so I'd be concerned if this guideline does not specify that."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	No	"The guideline is about the relationships between/among students. But these strategies are primarily about the relationship between the instructor and the student."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	22 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.8 Institutional support/PD	
Guideline	Guideline.II.8.1: Faculty should enhance learners' self-directed learning, self-regulation, and self-efficacy through chats and conversations with students.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, but I think this is more complicated than just 'chats'. Also, many faculty are not confident or expert in these areas themselves."
R2	Yes	"S.II.8.a is exactly the same as S.I.12.a. S.II.8.a again raises the issue as to whether or not all faculty or teachers should be teaching this content, content with which they are unlikely to be familiar."
R3	Yes	"Yes, but it's hard to get students to be self-directed. That's why deadlines are so important..."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	No	"I don't see that connection between the strategies and the term institutional support."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies"
R7	Yes	"They seem to align."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	23 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.9 Instructional Scaffolding	
Guideline	Guideline.II.9.1: Faculty should offer instructional scaffolding	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"This should be standard practice in every course."
R2	Yes	"Providing students with avenues to express their thoughts related to the course I am contact has been addressed in at least two other places."
R3	Yes	"yes, this makes sense in a traditional, 16 week course. It's hard in an accelerated environment."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Scaffolding is effective to teach students who are taking online and self-paced instruction."
R6	No	"See the comment regarding instructional scaffolding in previous session."
R7	No	"The guideline is too vague and the strategy is specific about learning about students' thoughts."
R8	Yes	"Good idea."

Care Element	II. Dialogue	
Data Set No	24 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.II.10 Presence, Availability & Community Building	
Guideline	Guideline.II.10.1: Faculty should enhance presence (cognitive, social, & teaching) and community building.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I feel that I already discussed this previously in the survey."
R2	Yes	"Reading these Dialogue strategies it's unclear what the differences are between Modeling and Dialogue." "It seems that most of the strategies in Dialogue were provided in Modeling. Perhaps these two larger categories should be combined."
R3	Yes	"Yes, I am a huge proponent of creating online communities of practice". "I think there is some space for consideration re: different learning timelines and what is feasible within in them."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"These strategies help in the development of social presence."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	Yes	"They seem to align."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	III. Practice	
Data Set No	25 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.III.1. Peer Mentoring	
Guideline	Guideline.III.1.1: Faculty should assign a role of mentoring for online learners with their peers.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	No	"I'm not convinced that in-class peer mentoring is that effective."
R2	Yes	"While this strategy is good, in general, it's implementation will depend to a large extent on the nature of the course, the nature of the students, and the nature of the teacher."
R3	Yes	"For undergraduates, sure. For graduate students, this is usually sought out on their own, in my experience, but it wouldn't hurt."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Peer mentoring contributes to social presence in online environments and creates community, which is effective in learning environments."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	Yes	"they are similar."
R8	Yes	"Good idea."

Care Element	III. Practice	
Data Set No	26 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.III.2 Collaboration/Peer-to-Peer Support	
Guideline	Guideline.III.2.1: Faculty should encourage their learners to support their peers and care for them.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Yes, this should be encouraged. I think it relates to efforts to build a cohort mindset, rather than an individualistic one."
R2	Yes	"The third strategy simply provides the technological implementation of the second strategy. The third strategy isn't actually a strategy." "As mentioned previously, strategies should be combined where possible to reduce the overall number of strategies. 'Encourage collaborative learning, potentially through the application of tools such as Google drive and one drive.'"
R3	Yes	"Yes to b and c, but no way to a. I'm not going to monitor caring behaviors. That's nonsense."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"As mentioned, this contributes to social presence, support, and to use the more knowledgeable other/leverage expertise in the classroom."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies for collaboration/Peer-to-peer support."
R7	Yes	"they align."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas"

Care Element	III. Practice	
Data Set No	27 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.III.3 Social Presence & Community Building	
Guideline	Guideline.III.3.1: Faculty should enhance social presence and community building through group work activities and video conferencing.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I'm generally in favor of this, but I recognize many students find group work challenging - due to time constraints different expectation etc."
R2	Yes	"As with the previous set of strategies, the first strategy isn't a strategy, but rather, suggestions for technological implementation." "Also, similar to a previous set of strategies, the use of team teaching (and peer mentoring) will depend on the nature of the content, students, and teacher."
R3	No	"I don't think it makes sense to use tools outside the LMS for communication/collaboration... I can see the use for assignments, like say if they have a concept map due and they use Lucid Chart to make it." "I think faculty should be aware of these applications and recommend them when they make sense." "I also don't have time for team teaching."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Group work and interactions are one of the most effective ways to promote social presence in the ERT classroom."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	Yes	"they align."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	IV. Confirmation	
Data Set No	28 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.IV.1 Personalization	
Guideline	Guideline.IV.1.1: Faculty should personalize their feedback approaches when confirming their learners' best behaviors and qualities.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I think clear feedback is one of the most important skills faculty can have - it's also one of the hardest to develop."
R2	Yes	"This set of strategy seems like a subset to previous strategies related to personalization in feedback." "This goes back to a previous comment where perhaps it would be better to organize these lists based on category, general strategy, and specific strategies."
R3	Yes	"Absolutely. Again, this should be considered basic."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"Personalized feedback sends a clear message to the learner that the faculty is directly engaged with the learner's work."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	No	"I don't understand the last part about 'best behaviors' and qualities." "The strategies don't suggest that they need to do that. The first one says affirm abilities, but that isn't necessarily their best behaviors or qualities."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."

Care Element	IV. Confirmation	
Data Set No	29 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.IV.2 Pacing	
Guideline	Guideline.IV.2.1: Faculty should allow space between assignments and their grading.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"Feedback is really important". "I think feedback should come earlier in the course- there's almost no value in providing feedback on final assessments - as that's often the terminal point for students."
R2	Yes	"Hmmm . . . This is the first strategy that includes an example, which is good, and exemplifies the general strategy/specific strategy approach."
R3	Yes	"Absolutely. However, I find that most don't want to wait seven days and will assess your teaching poorly if it takes that long."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"This gives ample time to the learner to read feedback, process it, and apply it."
R6	No	"Building pacing and consistency pattern seems both important."
R7	No	"It's not clear what is meant by pace between assignments."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas".

Care Element	IV. Confirmation	
Data Set No	30 of 30	
Data Set Title	Reviewers' feedback on Guideline T.IV.3 Institutional support/PD	
Guideline	Guideline.IV.3.1: Faculty should help learners enhance their online experience by covering topics such as self-directedness, self-regulation, and self-efficacy.	
Reviewer No	Effective Yes/No	Comments
R1	Yes	"I think we've covered this already"?
R2	Yes	"S.IV.3.a is the third time for 'self-directed learning, motivation, Internet self-efficacy, online communication self-efficacy, and learner's agency (Hung et al., 2010; Xie & Rice, 2021).' " "The final strategy doesn't seem to align with the rest of the strategies in focus."
R3	Yes	"It would be nice if instructional designers knew anything about their jobs. In my experience, they are bureaucrats who don't actually care about learning."
R4	Yes	"Logical and evidenced in research."
R5	Yes	"I still think the name of the guideline is not connected to the strategies."
R6	Yes	"Good strategies."
R7	Yes	"However, this was already covered by at least one or two other guidelines."
R8	Yes	"Good ideas."