

DOI 10.31651/2524-2660-2021-4-63-70  
ORCID 0000-0003-0378-1044

**KAMENOVA Dimitrina**

PhD in Pedagogy, Professor of Department for modern education,  
Varna University of Management, Bulgaria  
*e-mail:* dimitrina.kamenova@vumk.eu

ORCID 0000-0003-4311-9709

**ARKHYPOVA Svitlana**

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,  
Professor of Educational and Socio-Cultural Management and Social Work Department  
Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University at Cherkasy  
*e-mail:* s.arhipova@cdu.edu.ua

УДК 378.091.2:001.895(045)

**USE OF TEAM TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

*The article presents the experience of the authors for modernization of higher education orientated towards the student.*

*The essence of team teaching, whose resources have long been used in the Western educational tradition, but still insufficient in higher education of Ukraine and Bulgaria is revealed. Its use proves that it is a strong tool for sustainability of the edu-*

*cational process in a time of extreme complexity and unpredictability compared to conducting training with a single lecturer. In a wide range, team teaching can successfully include digital technology (computer) by both lecturers, as shown in the situation caused by COVID-19. The results of the trainings are the basis for building a Team Teaching Competence Standard. This Standard can be used*

as a guide for training university lecturers in networking, as well as a tool for assessing the growing need for team competence in higher education.

**Keywords:** team teaching; team competence; team teaching competence standard.

**Problem Statement.** In the "age of digital entertainment and crushing complexity" (R. Sharma) a very challenging context is emerging for higher education, which requires not only the continuation of its modernization, but also its continuous evaluation and updating. *The first research question* immediately arises whether there is sufficient theoretical clarity about the directions, content and methodology (ways, means, technologies) for modernization of educational practice in institutions providing higher education? Our experience of conducting numerous (more than 20) short-term trainings for teachers from higher education institutions in Bulgaria and Ukraine, as well as various internships with international participation, reveals that the awareness of the need to modernize higher education is not new. However, although the European Higher Education Area is being built [1, p.3], the need for modernization is growing and it is becoming increasingly unstable both in intensity and depth and in value content. And this reveals not only the global economic, socio-cultural situation, the series of financial crises, but also the global pandemic. On the other hand, "globalization is becoming increasingly socio-cultural in nature, with global cultural exchange and integration potentially weakening traditional national norms and institutions" [1, P. 5], including the boundaries of the universities themselves.

Thus, the key challenges for higher education in Europe, and not only, are the prospects for modernization:

- adaptation to unfamiliar situations in times of deep uncertainty by perceiving change as an opportunity and receptivity to new ideas, dynamic change of roles by academics, whether it is training in design, tourism, marketing, sports, management, psychology, hotel business, or other;
- encouraging experimentation, new ways of working and the search for a variety of perceptions inevitably prove to be powerful forms of innovation for sustainability;
- these challenges are transformed as current and urgent goals for higher education such as:
  - preparation of lecturers for networking to update the methodology and exchange of knowledge with students and colleagues;
  - increasing research through participation in international teams and together with

students in order to support business and society through innovations.

Only the widespread use of digital technologies, as imposed by the global COVID-19 pandemic, will not achieve the modernization of higher education. In fact, they create the conditions for opening the university to the global world, and over the national and regional borders for teaching through team teaching.

*The second research question arises:* how will the university open up to life so that each lecturer researches in order to know and meet life's requirements, to try to achieve them through his specific teaching and research work?

Modernization can also be defined as "a process of transition to education from one state to another, with clear articulated goals. The problem of modernization means the renewal of educational activities in all elements of the system. It is solved by theoretical and practical methods" [ibid., P. 17]. This results in *the third research question:*

- what are the goals of higher education today – what type of professional do we build;
- on what system of values should each meeting-event with the students, through which the goals are realized, be based;
- what are the main problems of life and the world that every lecturer at the university is called to solve through his research, along with his students and other "life" institutions in global education?

To bring clarity to the identified problems through a model of global higher education and team teaching as one of the tools for modernization of the educational activity. In our opinion, team teaching is directly related to the integration of efforts, socio-cultural cohesion, cooperation and partnership in relation to the educational process itself, both inside and outside the university: with regard to goals and objectives, principles, forms and methods of education. In particular, team teaching (including online) is emerging as a way to effectively reduce the complexity of problems, to ensure integration and cultural exchange, which will strengthen opportunities for students for both self-study and high professional and socio-cultural preparation.

COVID-19 further confirmed, through the necessary training in a digital environment, the need to maintain didactic interaction despite the impossibility of direct communication in the classrooms. Involving two or more lecturers in a single teaching process makes it possible to create teaching teams. Not only from the same university, not only teachers and students of the same specialty and nationality, but also internationally, for

which the Erasmus+ program for an active polylogist creates conditions.

**Analysis of the Recent Research and Publications.** One of the tools for developing and using these current skills is team teaching. Since 1964, when the first publication on team teaching appeared, authors such as K. Goetz [2], J. Gawel [3], S. Maroney [4], B. Robinson & R. Schaible [5], S. Quinn & S. Kanter [6], J. Van Vleck, and D. Bickford [7], Rumsey, D.J. [8], R. Brandenburg [9] and others have been working on theorizing different variants.

Therefore, we believe that the Team Teaching Competence Standard formulated by us can fill a theoretical gap for the practical implementation of both team teaching and the creation of mobile interdisciplinary and international teaching teams that can rise in research. This would strengthen the sense of sustainability in the rapidly changing world of higher education and would help businesses achieve it. Dynamic international cooperation would become a necessary condition for the integration of higher education institutions in the family of European and world universities, provide partnerships with foreign scholars and strengthen intercultural ties.

**The aim and objectives of the article.**

To analyse the possibilities of training a modern specialist in the context of globalization and modernization of higher education in the XXI century based on the growing integration between lecturers from different countries, ready to work in teams. To describe the standard of team teaching competence.

**Presenting the main material.** The foundations for experience of team teaching are found by the authors, both in their team working in joint trainings and internships with university professors in Bulgaria, Ukraine and other countries, and in numerous attempts to differentiate diverse ways to create teams in higher education. So far, they are either intuitively accumulating, or are the result of episodic training and education as a personal initiative of lecturers and there is no degree of institutionalized confirmation of reliability.

The modernization of higher education must unequivocally make a turn – meaningful, organizational and methodological – focused on the potential and development of the student, in order to be adequate to the requirements of life in a global environment.

Team teaching in global higher education is a challenge of our time. As can be seen,

the main characteristics of global higher education and of modern university lecturer justify team teaching as an objective necessity. Teamwork training involves students and faculty from abroad and requires appropriate skills from the participants. It is important to note here that the teaching staff in higher education tends to work in groups primarily through the organization of research in the educational process, because the work of the scientific-pedagogical worker of the university is bilateral – on one hand, the professional training of modern specialist, and, on other hand, the research work in the chosen direction. Therefore, as a tool for evaluating the achievements of each member of the teaching team – among researchers, partners and specialists to participate in the team work on professional training of a modern specialist, an attempt is made to construct the so called Team Teaching Competence Standard (TTCS) (authors' interpretation).

The basis for building the standard is the understanding that not every working group is a team. It is well known that a team consists of two or more experts linked by a *common goal*. Team members also have additional skills and create synergies through *coordinated efforts*. Synergy adds *value* to teamwork on a project. Our understanding of the teaching staff in higher education is that *it is a small group of people, experts in their field, with additional skills that are directly related to achieving specific common goals, unique results and organizational excellence through an approach that adheres to mutual responsibility*. This understanding made it possible to identify the main components of the standard of team teaching competence such as: *functionality, orientation, productivity and leadership* (see below).

The reasons that draw our attention to the use of team teaching are related to its capabilities. First, to achieve the individualization of education, second, the irrevocable involvement of everyone in their work and, third, the mastery of social skills that are reciprocally developed both between lecturers and together with their students.

The theoretical framework of the second research question related to team teaching requires its definition. In the scientific literature there are concepts that define it as cooperative, collaborative, integrative teaching. Team teaching can be defined as *a group of two or more lecturers working together to plan, conduct and evaluate the*

*learning activities (results) of the same group of students* [2] as early as 1964. The term co-teaching was introduced by L. Cook and M. Friend [10] with main characteristics: *dynamism, interactivity, coherence, division, consistency, a high degree of individualization, full involvement and participation*. Team teaching is also defined as a process of: addressing and responding to the diversity of students' needs, allowing participation in the study of cultures and disciplines, and removing barriers to learning by providing appropriate structures and arrangements to enable each student to get the most out of his attendance of education institution (NCSE 2010) [11].

According to a number of researchers, the modernization that team teaching brings rests on the potential for individualization (M. Friend); brings diversity and support (Def?), ensures the participation of all and higher performance, which increased by 19,4% compared to traditional training by one lecturer (Chrisman); becomes catalyst for quality, requires shared responsibility (R.A. Villa, J.S. Thousand, A.I. Nevin) [12], as well as a rational allocation of time and less time to establish discipline and demanding behavior (Weichel). But at the same time it requires more resources – didactic, material, human (K.J. Graziano, L.A. Navarrete) [13], adaptation of the environment to the individual (C. Murphy, J. Beggs) [14], and not vice versa, shared methodology, increasing trust.

Team teaching provides an opportunity for *innovative methodology* through a wider variety of teaching strategies and approaches, clear learning objectives, forming strategies for identifying student progress in order to find the most right approaches to learning, and the content of the classes is tailored to the needs of students and their ability levels. The team of lecturers monitors the individual progress of students and evaluates the effectiveness of teaching and learning. In higher education, the content of the expected results of team teaching largely reflects the dynamics in the requirements of employers. This requires more systematic research of their needs and identification of the most important, from their point of view, learning outcomes, which become goals of the teaching teams.

One of the advantages of team teaching is that all students enjoy an appropriate support network, allowing them to fully participate in the life and work of the university,

whatever their needs. There are many different ways for each student to achieve this.

Some of the *practical benefits* of team teaching lie in avoiding:

- work on one curriculum from each separately, and in the team teaching two / or more joint programs simultaneously;
- fragmented learning, leading to student despair;
- lack of time for joint work;
- lack of generalization of skills through more exercises;
- lack of independent work in class;
- double (and more) homework;
- feeling vulnerable in a "one-to-one" situation [15].

*Advantages* of team teaching are:

- Achieving higher efficiency and effectiveness: the team of lecturers works with time savings, with less conflicts, with higher satisfaction;
- unified curriculum and standard of skills;
- unified modular book;
- unified assessment tools;

*The benefits of team teaching for lecturers* can be seen in the fact that it:

- is a way to diagnose individual achievements, needs – personal and students' – and to draw up discussed paths for development;
- is a way to model and promote respectful working relationships between two or more adults who become role models for the student;
- allows both teachers to contribute to specific topics that can allow two ideas or strategies to be taught at the same time;
- convinces students more strongly that the teacher is effective and fun.

The practical benefits for lecturers of team teaching involve the following:

- the variety of team teaching resources reveals that there seem to be as many types of team teaching as there are team lecturers;
- it proves to be a more effective way to create and maintain the attention and level of interest of students, as each member of the team brings out different aspects of the problem;
- students can benefit from adults collaborating on a goal that some of them may not see in a classroom with one teacher.

Researchers see the benefits of team teaching for students in the greater opportunities it provides for self-knowledge and self-assessment (see Table 1).

Benefits for the student from team teaching

<i>Self-knowledge:</i>	<i>Self-development:</i>
– strengths and weaknesses;	– to observe and analyze different behaviors and to correlate his own behavior in different situations;
– what qualities he possesses and what he wants to possess;	– to be able to perceive and like, which means striving for self-affirmation (assertiveness);
– when to give up and when to continue;	– to compare himself with other people and to correct his own deficit and behavior;
– his value (self-perception);	– to assess his self-confidence;
– to develop additional values for work in different teams and outside the university	– to improve his performance impressively, etc.

Defining, revealing the benefits and advantages of team teaching, but most of all the experience of its use, help to construct a Team Teaching Competence Standard. Because each experience of team teaching is different not only in topic, not only in the number of teachers in the team, not only in their national and university affiliation, but also in the eligibility of students and business and society representatives, not only in quality of didactic materials, on the inclusion or not of digital devices and platforms, the Standard creates a sense of sustainability of both preparation and implementation. The indicators against which the standard of team competence skills is developed are related to the process of functioning, orientation and productivity of the team of teachers (including students and others).

#### **Team Teaching Competence Standard.**

Our experience in training university lecturers in team teaching reveals that for teaching staff in higher education (TSHE) are inherent:

1) innovation – TSHE is oriented towards achieving educational innovations, which must be justified, implemented and can be published as a scientific work;

2) creativity – is based on creative approaches to the professional development of students to develop creativity in them. It is achieved through a variety of methods and attractive design of lectures, classes and practical exercises;

3) mobility of the structure and roles – the team excellence of the teaching teams in higher education allows more and different students in the team – both for teaching and for the development of research competence. In addition, it highlights the growing importance of the facilitating, moderating and advisory role in the interaction between faculty and students;

4) leadership – is characterized by opportunities for students to gain example and experience not from one but from several

expert professors, who as leaders in different periods of teamwork seek to create leaders within the team, including among students;

5) heterogeneity – unites teachers (and students) from different specialties, attracts business partners and organizations from the educational context of users of educational services at the university;

6) expertise – each of the members of TSHE must be an expert in their field;

7) integrativeness – both thematic and between teachers and students, and by attracting a growing audience inside and outside the university.

The presented distinctive features of TSHE with different weight are present in an operationalized way as skills in the components of the Team Teaching Competence Standard in higher education (TTCSHE), namely:

1) functionality – expressed as attitude and readiness to participate in the role of a member of TSHE;

2) orientation – expressed as involvement in the work of TSHE through expert knowledge and skills and specific expert ways of teaching;

3) productivity – expressed in achieving team excellence through unique for the team methods and mechanisms for team teaching in higher education;

4) team leadership – expressed in a set of skills for creating leaders among team members, including students.

Based on these differences, and the practice will probably reveal others, the authors of the article abstract the Team Teaching Competence Standard in higher education (TTCSHE) through the results of their experience in team teaching training.

**Conclusions and perspectives of further research.** The present research, based on the theoretical analysis and above all on the practical results of the authors' experience in team teaching, contains perspectives for development.

On the other hand, the creation of different teams by nationality, by specialties, by the diversity of the participants' experience, even by gender differences, with or without the computer and the robot, can detail the individual indicators on which the standard is created. In addition, the four components of the Team Teaching Competence Standard can be considered in more detail by experimenting with the main types of team teaching, which are not problematized here due to lack of space and time. Interested lecturers could use some of the authors' achievements (see, for example, [12, p. 55]), as well as the classification of six models of team teaching identified by S. Maroney [4] and B. Robinson and R. Schaible [5]. It will probably reveal the need to add new and different skills to each of the types of team teaching. Perhaps as a research whim in the pursuit of research sophistication, there will be a need to detail the national differences that each teacher or student or business, in an international team brings with it, which will add a cultural touch to the team. Probably the moment is not far off when whole teams will appear as job candidates, instead of single individuals, even the best experts in a given field.

#### References

- Executive Report MODERN (2012). Conference on Engaging in the Modernisation Agenda for European Higher Education, Brussels, 12 January.
- Goetz, K. (2000). Perspectives on Team Teaching. *EGallery*, 1(4). Retrieved from <https://people.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html>.
- Gawel, J. (1997). Herzberg's theory of motivation and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 421 486*.
- Maroney, S. (1999). Team Teaching. Retrieved 14 October 1999, from <http://www.wiu.edu/users/mfsam1/TeamTchg.html>.
- Robinson, B. & Schaible, R. (1995). Collaborative teaching: Reaping the benefits. *College Teaching*, 43(2): 57-60.
- Quinn, S. & Kanter, S. (1984). Team Teaching: An Alternative to Lecture Fatigue (JC 850 005). *Paper in an abstract: Innovation Abstracts (Eric Document Reproductive Service No. ED 251 159)*.
- van Vleck, J. and Bickford, D. (1997). Reflections on Artful Teaching. *Journal of Management Education*, 21(4): 448-463, November.
- Rumsey, D.J. (1999). Cooperative teaching opportunities for Introductory Statistics teachers. *Mathematics Teacher*, 92 (8): 734-737.
- Brandenburg, R. (1997). Team Wise School of Knowledge: An Online Resource About Team Teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.uwf.edu/coehelp/teachingapproaches/team/>
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2003). *Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- National Council for Special Education (2010). Literature Review of the Principles and Practices relating to Inclusive Education for Children with Special Educational Needs. Retrieved from [https://ncse.ie/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/NCSE\\_Inclusion.pdf](https://ncse.ie/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/NCSE_Inclusion.pdf).
- Kamenova, D. (2020). Increasing the administrative capacity of teachers in schools and kindergartens: A handbook. Varna. [in Bulg.].
- Villa, R.A., Thousand, J.S., Nevin, A.I. (2013). *A Guide to Co-Teaching: New Lessons and Strategies to Facilitate Student Learning*. Buch. Softcover. 280 p.
- Graziano, K.J., & Navarrete, L.A. (2012). Co-Teaching in a Teacher Education Classroom: Collaboration, Compromise, and Creativity. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 21: 109.
- Murphy, C., Beggs, J. (2003). Children's perceptions of school science. *The School science review*, 84(308). April.
- King, L.A., Hicks, J.A., Krull, J.L., & Del Gaiso, A.K. (2006). Positive affect and the experience of meaning in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(1), 179-196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.1.179>
- Avanesov, V.S. (2011). Modernization of education: the main problems. *Education and society*, 1: 1-33 [in Rus.].
- Beauchamp, M.R., Barling, J., Li, Z., Morton, K.L., Keith, S.E., & Zumbo, B.D. (2010). Development and psychometric properties of the transformational teaching questionnaire. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 15: 1123-1134.
- Blanchard, K., Johnson, S. (2006). *One minute manager. The most popular management method in the world. Sofia: Classic and Style*. 115 p. [in Bulg.].
- Burnouf, L. (2004). Global Awareness and Perspectives in Global Education. *Canadian Social Studies*, 38(3). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1073942.pdf>.
- Byrne, E. (2012) *Global Change*. Sofia: Kibea House. 336 p. [in Bulg.].
- Drucker, P. (2000). *Management challenges in the 21st century*. Sofia: Classic and Style. 200 p. [in Bulg.].
- Fricke, H.J., Gathercole, C. and Skinner, A. (2014). Monitoring Education for Global Citizenship: A Contribution to Debate. Retrieved from [https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/DEEEP4\\_QualityImpact\\_Report\\_2014\\_web1.pdf](https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/DEEEP4_QualityImpact_Report_2014_web1.pdf)
- Friedman, T. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the 21st century*. Sofia: Obsidian. 488 p. [in Bulg.].
- Good Practice Paper: публикуван от Комитета за подпомагане на развитието при Организацията за икономическо сътрудничество и развитие (OECD/DAC).
- Hicks, D. (2008). Different views, origins of Global Education. *United Kingdom: presentation at the Conference on Education for Sustainable Development*. 226 p. [in Bulg.].
- Hunt, F. (2012). *Global Learning in Primary Schools in England: Practices and Impact*. *Development Education Research Centre*. Research Paper no. 9. London: Institute of Education.
- Kalimullin, A.M., & Utemov, V.V. (2017). Open type tasks as a tool for developing creativity in secondary school students. *Interchange*, 48(2): 129-144 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-016-9295-5>.
- Karsteva, L. (2015). What is global education? Veliko Tarnovo, October 16-18, 2015. *LET'S LEARN! The resource page for global civic education*. Retrieved from <http://devedu.eu/какво-е-глобално-образование/> [in Bulg.].
- Leamer, E.E. (2006). A Flat World, A Level Playing Field, a Small World After All, or None of the Above? Review of Thomas L Friedman, *The World is Flat*. Retrieved from [www.uclaforecast.com/reviews/Leamer\\_FlatWorld\\_060221.pdf](http://www.uclaforecast.com/reviews/Leamer_FlatWorld_060221.pdf)
- Loughland, T. (2019). Adaptive Teaching for Students' Critical and Creative Thinking. In: *Teacher Adaptive Practices. SpringerBriefs in Education*. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6858-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6858-5_1).

32. Northern Nevada Writing Project Teacher-Researcher Group. (1996). Team teaching. Peterborough NH: Crystal Springs Books. URL: [http://www.crystalsprings.com/shopsite\\_sc/store/html/5027W4.htm](http://www.crystalsprings.com/shopsite_sc/store/html/5027W4.htm)
33. Pachler, D., Kuonath, A., Frey, D. (2019). Как трансформационните лекции насърчават ангажираността, креативността и изпълнението на задачите на учениците: посредническата роля на доверието в преподавателя и самоефективността. Учене и индивидуални разлики, 69: 162-172. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.106/j.lindif.2018.12.004> [in Bulg.].
34. Sharma, R. (2018). Club 5 in the morning. Sofia: Eclibris. 368 p. [in Bulg.].
35. Sitarov, V.A. (2014). Pedagogical management as theory and practice of educational process management. *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*, 3: 7-13 [in Rus.].
- Список бібліографічних посилань**
- Executive Report MODERN. Conference on Engaging in the Modernisation Agenda for European Higher Education, Brussels, 12 January, 2012.
  - Goetz K. Perspectives on Team Teaching. *EGallery*, 2000. 1(4). URL: <https://people.ucalgary.ca/~egallery/goetz.html>.
  - 03 Gawel J. Herzberg's theory of motivation and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 421 486*, 1997.
  - Maroney S. Team Teaching. URL: <http://www.wiu.edu/users/mfsam1/TeamTchg.html> (14 October 1999).
  - Robinson B. & Schaible R. Collaborative teaching: Reaping the benefits. *College Teaching*, 1995. No 43(2). P. 57-60.
  - Quinn S. & Kanter S. Team Teaching: An Alternative to Lecture Fatigue (JC 850 005). *Paper in an abstract: Innovation Abstracts (Eric Document Reproductive Service No. ED 251 159)*, 1984.
  - van Vleck J. and Bickford D. Reflections on Artful Teaching. *Journal of Management Education*, 1997. No 21(4). P. 448-463, November.
  - Rumsey D.J. Cooperative teaching opportunities for Introductory Statistics teachers. *Mathematics Teacher*, 1999. No 92(8). P. 734-737.
  - Brandenburg R. Team Wise School of Knowledge: An Online Resource About Team Teaching. 1997. URL: <http://www.uwf.edu/coehelp/teachingapproaches/team/>
  - Friend M., & Cook L. Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2003.
  - National Council for Special Education. Literature Review of the Principles and Practices relating to Inclusive Education for Children with Special Educational Needs. Retrieved from [https://ncse.ie/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/NCSE\\_Inclusion.pdf](https://ncse.ie/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/NCSE_Inclusion.pdf).
  - Villa R.A., Thousand J.S., Nevin A.I. A Guide to Co-Teaching: New Lessons and Strategies to Facilitate Student Learning. Buch. Softcover, 2013. 280 p.
  - Каменова Д. Повишаване на административния капацитет на учителите в училището и детската градина: Наръчник. Варна, 2020.
  - Graziano K.J., & Navarrete L.A. Co-Teaching in a Teacher Education Classroom: Collaboration, Compromise, and Creativity. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 2012. 21. PP. 109.
  - Murphy C., Beggs J. Children's perceptions of school science. *The School science review*, 2003. 84(308). April.
  - King L.A., Hicks J.A., Krull J.L., & Del Gaiso A.K. Positive affect and the experience of meaning in life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2006. 90(1). PP. 179-196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.1.179>
  - Аванесов В.С. Модернизация образования: основные проблемы. *Образование и общество*, 2011. №1. С. 1-33.
  - Beauchamp M.R., Barling J., Li Z., Morton K.L., Keith S.E., & Zumbo B.D. Development and psychometric properties of the transformational teaching questionnaire. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2010. No 15. PP. 1123-1134.
  - Бланчард К., Джонсън С. Едноминутен мениджър. Най-популярният управленски метод в света. София: Класика и Стил, 2006. 115 с.
  - Burnouf L. Global Awareness and Perspectives in Global Education. *Canadian Social Studies*, 2004. No 38(3). URL: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1073942.pdf>.
  - Бърн Е. Глобалната промяна. София: Къща Кибеа, 2012. 336 с.
  - Дракър П. Мениджмънт предизвикателствата през 21 век. София: Класика и Стил, 2000. 200 с.
  - Fricke H.J., Gathercole C. and Skinner A. Monitoring Education for Global Citizenship: A Contribution to Debate. URL: [https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/DEEEP4\\_QualityImpact\\_Report\\_2014\\_web1.pdf](https://www.gcedclearinghouse.org/sites/default/files/resources/DEEEP4_QualityImpact_Report_2014_web1.pdf)
  - Фридман Т. Светът е плосък: Кратка история на XXI век. София: Обсидиан, 2006. 488 с.
  - Good Practice Paper: публикуван от Комитета за подпомагане на развитието при Организацията за икономическо сътрудничество и развитие (OECD/ДАС).
  - Хикс Д. Различни погледи, произход на Глобалното образование. *Обединеното Кралство: представяне на Конференцията по Образование за устойчиво развитие*, 2008. 226 с.
  - Hunt F. Global Learning in Primary Schools in England: Practices and Impact. *Development Education Research Centre. Research Paper no. 9*. London: Institute of Education, 2012.
  - Kalimullin A.M., & Utemov V.V. Open type tasks as a tool for developing creativity in secondary school students. *Interchange*, 2017. No 48(2). P. 129-144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-016-9295-5>.
  - Кърстева Л. Какво е глобално образование? Велико Търново, 16-18 октомври 2015. *ДА НАУЧИМ! Ресурсната страница за глобално гражданско образование*. URL: <http://devedu.eu/какво-е-глобално-образование/>.
  - Leamer E.E. A Flat World, A Level Playing Field, a Small World After All, or None of the Above? Review of Thomas L Friedman, The World is Flat. 2006. URL: [www.uclaforecast.com/reviews/Leamer\\_FlatWorld\\_060221.pdf](http://www.uclaforecast.com/reviews/Leamer_FlatWorld_060221.pdf)
  - Loughland T. Adaptive Teaching for Students' Critical and Creative Thinking. In: *Teacher Adaptive Practices. SpringerBriefs in Education*. 2019. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6858-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-6858-5_1)
  - Northern Nevada Writing Project Teacher-Researcher Group. (1996). Team teaching. Peterborough NH: Crystal Springs Books. URL: [http://www.crystalsprings.com/shopsite\\_sc/store/html/5027W4.htm](http://www.crystalsprings.com/shopsite_sc/store/html/5027W4.htm)
  - Pachler D., Kuonath A., Frey D. Как трансформационните лекции насърчават ангажираността, креативността и изпълнението на задачите на учениците: посредническата роля на доверието в преподавателя и самоефективността. *Учене и индивидуални разлики*, 2019. No 69. P. 162-172. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.106/j.lindif.2018.12.004>
  - Шарма Р. Клуб 5 сутринта. София: Еклибрис, 2018. 368 с.
  - Ситаров В.А. Педагогический менеджмент как теория и практика управления образовательным процессом. *Знание. Понимание. Умение*, 2014. № 3, С. 7-13.

**КАМЕНОВА Дімітріна**

кандидатка педагогічних наук, професорка кафедри сучасної освіти,  
Варненський університет менеджменту, Болгарія

**АРХИПОВА Світлана**

докторка педагогічних наук, професорка,  
професорка кафедри освітнього і соціокультурного менеджменту та соціальної роботи  
Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького

**ВИКОРИСТАННЯ КОМАНДНОГО НАВЧАННЯ У ВИЩІЙ ОСВІТІ**

**Резюме.** Вступ. Командне навчання є одним із інструментів модернізації освітньої діяльності в умовах глобалізації вищої освіти. Командне навчання безпосередньо пов'язане з інтеграцією зусиль, соціокультурною згуртованістю, співробітництвом і партнерством у освітньому процесі.

**Мета.** Проаналізувати можливості підготовки сучасного спеціаліста в умовах глобалізації та модернізації вищої освіти у XXI столітті на основі зростаючої інтеграції викладачів із різних країн, готових працювати в команді. Охарактеризувати стандарт командної педагогічної компетентності.

**Методи.** Аналіз, синтез, порівняння, систематизація поглядів вчених (філософів, соціологів, психологів, педагогів) на різні аспекти командного навчання; моделювання для обґрунтування та розробки моделі стандарту командної педагогічної компетентності; педагогічне спостереження, бесіда, анкетування, співбесіда, тестування для аналізу особливостей та умов організації освітнього процесу за допомогою командного навчання.

**Результати.** Командне навчання дає змогу використовувати інноваційні методики через більш широкий спектр навчальних стратегій і підходів, чіткі навчальні цілі. У статті представлені переваги командного навчання для педагогічного колективу та

студентів.

**Оригінальність.** Представлено Стандарт командної педагогічної компетентності та визначено його основні компоненти: функціональність, спрямованість, продуктивність, керівництво командою.

**Висновок.** Вивчення особливостей командного навчання на основі теоретичного аналізу, а особливо практичних результатів досвіду авторів колективного навчання, містить перспективи розвитку. Колективне навчання має на меті задовольнити різноманітні потреби студентів і реагувати на них, дозволяючи їм брати участь у вивченні культур і дисциплін, а також усувати перешкоди для навчання, забезпечуючи відповідні структури та механізми, які дозволять кожному студенту отримати більше користі від відвідування навчального закладу.

**Ключові слова:** командне навчання; командна компетентність; стандарт командної педагогічної компетентності.

Одержано редакцією 14.11.2021  
Прийнято до публікації 24.11.2021