



Co-teaching in higher education: best practices

Dr. Lyndsay R. Buckingham

Dr. Alfonso López Hernández

Arturo Peral Santamaría

Dr. Birgit Strotmann

Comillas Pontifical University

Madrid (Spain)

Abstract

Co-teaching is not a frequent practice in the Spanish university system. It not only requires preplanning, communicating weekly and fixing specific roles among the co-teachers, but it also depends upon the active participation and support of other key players involved, such as students or heads of department. Although difficult to implement, it is a practice that contributes to professional development among teachers, who can benefit from the collaboration and develop innovative methodologies. It also makes the teaching-learning process more efficient, as it helps avoid redundancies in syllabus and offers a wider view to students thanks to the exposure to a variety of teaching styles. Taking up the challenge of co-teaching at a university level, various lecturers in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences at Universidad Pontificia Comillas (Madrid, Spain) have successfully used different co-teaching models in their classes in a variety of degrees. This paper provides an analysis of their experience and suggestions of best practices.

1. Description

University lecturers at Universidad Pontificia Comillas (Madrid, Spain) have ventured into co-teaching practices in an attempt to improve both student experience, in the form

of the reduction of redundancy in contents and exposure to multiple perspectives, and teacher experience, through effective collaboration and professional development. This endeavor has been undertaken in the framework of a university-sponsored innovation project in which several lecturers took part and formed partnerships to teach courses within the degrees of Infant Education, Primary Education and Translation and Interpreting. Previous research of collaborative practices around the world suggested that the effort employed would offer a substantial return on investment.

According to the OECD, collaboration among teachers contributes to professional development as they learn from each other and consequently improve their own practices. It can also lead to more innovative methodologies, benefitting students as a result (OECD, 2020). Collaboration has also been defined as one of the key 21st century competences to be developed in educational institutions (Voogt & Roblin, 2012). Co-teaching is the result of close collaboration between two or more teachers, who share responsibilities for a given group of students and subject(s). This partnership can take many forms, as detailed in Table 1, though the experience hereinafter described involves Models 2 and 4. Cook and Friend (1995) named these two models Team teaching and Station teaching, respectively, terms which will also be used in this paper.

Table 1

Models of instruction

Model	Number of student groups	Role of Teacher 1	Role of Teacher 2
1	1	Leads the class	Assists individuals or small groups as needed
2	1	Teach content simultaneously	
3	1	Teach content	Assess students
4	2	Teach content to separate groups	
5	2	Pre-teach	Teach alternative information
6	2	Re-teach	Teach alternative information
7	3+	Monitor and teach the various groups	

Adapted from Honigsfeld and Dove (2010)

Co-teaching has recently been implemented at the university level, particularly in initial teacher training degrees, resulting in partnerships between teacher trainees and in-service teachers (Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Murphy et al., 2015; Pettit, 2017;

Simons et al., 2020; Turan & Bayar, 2017) or between university lecturers as a model of collaboration (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2008; Ferguson & Wilson, 2011; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012; Ricci & Fingon, 2018). Studies have shown that collaborative competences, essential for future teachers, are developed while witnessing and/or taking part in an effective co-teaching relationship (Montgomery & Akerson, 2019; Simons et al., 2020). In recent years, several studies published about experiences of co-teaching in other fields of study have also suggested positive outcomes (Blanchard, 2012; Carbone et al., 2017; Lasagabaster et al., 2019; Lock et al., 2016; Morelock et al., 2017).

Research suggests that co-teaching provides several benefits to students, including a greater variety of instruction and pedagogical activities (Ferguson & Wilson, 2011; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012), raised awareness of multiple perspectives that surround an issue and increased critical thinking (Bacharach, Heck & Dahlberg, 2008; Blanchard, 2012; Ferguson & Wilson, 2011), and more diverse feedback from instructors (Ferguson & Wilson, 2011; Lasagabaster et al., 2019). When instructors are simultaneously present in the classroom, as in team teaching (Model 2), students additionally benefit from differentiation through increased individual attention and natural scaffolding techniques such as co-generative dialogue and clarifying questions (Graziano & Navarrete, 2012; Murphy & Martin, 2015).

Co-teaching as a practice is rare in the context of Spain (OECD, 2020), despite the push by educational experts to adopt the technique due to its many proven benefits (see Lasagabaster et al., 2019). This might be due to the difficulties of implementing co-teaching and the important considerations that must be made before undertaking the challenge. Instructors will need to demonstrate trust, mutual respect, and accountability in a co-teaching partnership (Graziano & Navarrete, 2012). They will also need to invest a significant amount of time and training to create an effective working relationship (Graziano & Navarrete, 2012; Ricci & Fingon, 2017). Finally, classroom protocol and processes should be clearly defined to avoid potential confusion and mistrust among students (Bacharach, Heck, Dahlberg, 2008; Ferguson & Wilson, 2011; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012). However, these drawbacks are overwhelmingly offset by the potential benefits, suggesting that co-teaching is worth the effort.

2. Type and context of experience

The co-teaching practices described were carried out at Universidad Pontificia Comillas, located in Madrid, Spain. The university, administered by the Society of Jesus, defines itself on its website as a Catholic university aligning its mission with the "Magna Charta Universitatum", signed in Bologna in 1988: "... an academic community that, in a rigorous and critical manner, contributes to the protection and development of human dignity and cultural heritage through research, teaching and providing a diverse range of services to local, national and international communities" (Universidad Pontificia Comillas, n.d.-a). Universidad Pontificia Comillas offers undergraduate, postgraduate and PhD programs to over 14,000 national and almost 3,000 international students (Universidad Pontificia Comillas, n.d.-b).

The innovation project on co-teaching was carried out in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, in the degrees of Infant Education, Primary Education and Translation and Interpreting. The participants were lecturers involved in partnerships, often between full-time lecturers and professionals in the field, who combined teaching with their profession; they belong to three different departments: (1) Translation, Interpreting and Multilingual Communication, (2) Education, Research Methods and Innovation and (3) Modern Languages Institute. The initial decision regarding the instructor pairs and the courses assigned was generally made by the head of studies or head of department, not by the individual lecturers. All experiences involved English either as a foreign language or as the language of instruction, or one of the languages of instruction.¹

The experience arose from two parallel and independent initiatives by small groups of instructors experimenting with co-teaching. One partnership was created among three lecturers in the Education degrees, while another was undertaken by two lecturers in

¹ More recently, the co-teaching model has been extended to the double degree of Psychology and Criminology, from the same School of Humanities and Social Sciences, and in a course that does not involve English as a foreign language, particularly in the course of Writing Techniques (or, in Spanish, Técnicas de Expresión Escrita). Data on the experience has not yet been analysed and, therefore, has not been included in this article.

the Translation and Interpreting degrees. When these lecturers learned about their colleagues' efforts in the other degrees, they decided to form an innovation group and apply for financial assistance from the university to fund research into the initiative. The institution itself promotes "teamwork, genuine collaboration and shared responsibility" as desirable qualities in its students and staff (Universidad Pontificia Comillas, n.d.-a) and provides two main opportunities to experience these: (1) it programs a series of classes to be shared by two or more instructors and (2) it provides annual teacher training sessions for sharing, networking, and discovering other initiatives. However, coordination between instructors is difficult due to diverse schedules – especially if the lecturers involved are professionals who combine teaching with another profession – and there is a general reluctance at universities in Spain to open the classroom to other teachers. In fact, Dr. Ana Halbach, leading Education researcher in the Spanish context, started her round table contribution at the 2016 IATEFL conference by stating:

I have to start by saying that I come from a context that is characterised by closed doors. There is no observation going on in Spain. Teachers go into their classrooms, close the door and that's it. [...] What happens in a context like this is that teaching is very, very lonely (Halbach, 2016).

The decision of the project team members to open the door to their classrooms to their co-teachers was the result of this fundamental loneliness leading to a desire to share, to improve together and provide a model for their students in class on how collaboration can improve results. After the two initial, separate experiences, the project group was formed, and co-teaching partnerships were established in six different courses (cf. Table 2).

Table 2*Co-teaching partnerships*

Group	Lecturers	Model of co-teaching	Degree program	Course	Timing
1	A and C	Model 2	Infant Education	Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) ²	Jan-May, 2020
2	B and C	Model 2	Primary education	Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)	Jan-May, 2020
3	D and E	Model 4	Translation and Interpreting	Strategies and techniques for written communication ³	Jan-May, 2020
4	D and E	Model 4	Translation and Interpreting	Strategies and techniques for oral communication ⁴	Jan-May, 2020
5	A and B	Model 4	Primary Education	Teaching English as a Foreign Language 2	Sept-Dec, 2020
6	D and F	Model 4	Translation and Interpreting	History and Literature of the English-Speaking countries B ⁵	Sept-Dec, 2020
7	B and G	Model 4	Infant education	Teaching English as a Foreign Language 2	Sept-Dec, 2020

Most partnerships followed the Model 4 approach, i.e., the same group was taught separately by two alternating teachers (also known as station teaching). In some cases

² CLIL is the predominant form of bilingual education practiced in Spain, offering a dual focus on both content and language acquisition in classrooms with a vehicular language that is not the student's native language.

³ Original Spanish course name: Técnicas y estrategias de comunicación escrita

⁴ Original Spanish course name: Técnicas y estrategias de comunicación oral

⁵ Original Spanish course name: Historia y Literatura B

(Groups 3, 4 and 6), professors alternated session by session; in other cases (Groups 5 and 7), teachers alternated in six-week intervals. Only two groups (1 and 2) were based on team teaching (Model 2), with both teachers present in the classroom simultaneously. Due to the changes required by the COVID-19 pandemic, all courses scheduled for the January – May period transitioned from on-campus classes to 100% online delivery in March, with less than a week's time to adapt content, assessment, and delivery. Partnerships successfully maintained the co-teaching model of their choice even during the lockdown, so the teaching dynamics did not change significantly when classes were taught online. The courses that took place from September to December were taught with a bimodal approach, i.e., alternating on campus and online classes from week to week.

3. Objectives and methodology

This initiative was undertaken in an effort to make the teaching-learning process more efficient in the different degrees. The objectives of the current study can be summarized in the following three statements: (1) reduce redundancies in course contents, (2) provide a wider vision of the contents to students, and (3) enrich the lecturer's experience.

In some degrees there are courses whose contents slightly overlap but which are treated as if they were new in each course. Relative to the first objective, it was assumed that, if lecturers worked more closely together, they would be able to reduce this overlap and build on what had been learned in other courses. Second, once these overlaps had been reduced, there would be an opportunity to delve deeper into the contents of each course, more effectively analyzing them from all sides. Indeed, the fact that more than one lecturer was involved would present students with multiple perspectives on the same contents, which they would be forced to compare and contrast and therefore draw conclusions, thus encouraging critical thinking. Finally, it was thought that close collaboration among lecturers would bring about professional development through negotiation of the syllabus and exposure to different methodologies. This collaboration would, in turn, improve the experience of the students creating an opportunity for

increased individual attention, more varied pedagogical intervention, and therefore, greater differentiation.

Each lecturer who took part in one of the co-teaching partnerships kept a reflection diary in which they wrote their impressions each week. They were asked to write about lesson planning and organization, teaching strategies and lesson delivery, teacher coordination and/or teacher interaction in class (depending on the model employed), general feedback, and future changes to consider. The authors read through the diaries and collaborated to create a list of best practices according to the areas of methodology, student experience, instructor experience, instructor coordination, professional development and concerns and feelings. What follows is a description of this systematic analysis.

4. Results obtained and lessons learned

This section summarizes the main results that were obtained from the analysis of the contents of the reflection journals. The authors will discuss the lessons learned about co-teaching in general, while also offering specific suggestions relevant to **station teaching** (Model 4) and **team teaching** (Model 2). Throughout, specific points will be made regarding the adaptation of traditional on-site instruction to an **online scenario**, following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

4.1 Teacher coordination and planning

To reap the full benefits of co-teaching, effective course planning and coordination between the co-teachers is paramount.

4.1.1 Pre- and post- course planning

It was found that preplanning is essential in order to avoid content overlap between instructors, as well as ensuring that the different units and tasks are divided in a logical way. Lecturers should meet well before the start of classes to plan the calendar and revise the contents, materials and assignments based on their observations during the

previous year, as well as any feedback collected from students. It is also recommended that they meet shortly after the end of classes, in order to collect suggestions of improvement. In both **station** and **team** teaching, a specific suggestion is to plan the course so that one co-teacher can substitute for the other, that is, being able to teach contents designed by the other co-teacher.

4.1.2 In-course coordination

Weekly communication is a special challenge in **station teaching**, especially when students meet the two lecturers in the same week. In the case of Group 6, for example, several challenges regarding in-course coordination are mentioned, including: teaching the same activity twice (“The only difficulty that arose with respect to sharing the class, was that Lecturer D had already used one of the teaching materials that I intended to use at the end of the class: a 10-minute video about the origins of the English language. This meant that I ran out of material 20 minutes before the end of class” [Lecturer F, Group 6]), lack of coordination as to who activates the homework (“During the weekend following my first class, I forgot to update the homework task on Moodle for my Friday class the following week. Lecturer D kindly offered to reactivate this homework task from the previous year, which she did” [Lecturer F, Group 6]) in the virtual campus, finishing content early or not getting through all the material, deciding whether online classes needed to be recorded, etc. Lecturers should communicate continuously about what has been covered, any pending contents or tasks, as well as areas of difficulty for students.

In the case of **team teaching**, co-teachers should be sure to plan the specific roles that each will take during each session or part thereof: leader, support, etc. If teaching an **online live seminar**, it will be important to clarify beforehand technical questions such as who uploads or shares the materials and whether one of the two co-teachers will be responsible for answering student questions and comments in the chat window. It is also important to be aware that team teaching is made more difficult in an online environment (“It will be challenging to maintain a team teaching approach in online classes, as there is no visual contact. In order for the second teacher to intervene, she

has to either interrupt the one speaking or say it in the chat. Therefore, there is a more obvious difference in teacher roles for the two teachers” [Lecturer A, Group 1]).

It is also highly advisable to involve the students actively in the process by asking them for specific feedback and suggestions of improvement at relevant moments in the semester. Exit tickets (physical or online) can be a great way to collect feedback.

Figure 1

Student feedback to co-teachers as mid-semester exit tickets



To support the planning process, the following digital tools have been found to be especially useful:

- A shared online calendar.
- Shared online folders for course materials.
- Email and text messaging for weekly communication.

- Online student surveys.

4.2 In-class experience

In co-teaching settings, it is common that lecturers feel increased insecurity owing to a certain loss of control over the instructional process. In turn, students may fail to see continuity between the work of the two co-teachers, to the point of perceiving the course as two different, independent modules, or, even worse, being confused by possible overlaps of content presentation.

As regards **station teaching**, bridging the sessions or contents taught by each co-teacher was found to be an especially effective strategy. This will be done differently depending on the specific station teaching arrangement.

If instructors swap groups from one session to the next, or on a weekly basis, it is recommended to include a short (say, 5-minute) summary of the main content presented by other instructor in the previous session. Students tend to appreciate this kind of summary (“I give a short summary of the previous session at the beginning of class and have a feeling that students do appreciate this and miss it whenever it is not provided” [Lecturer D, Group 6]; “Students comment that they find it hard to build bridges from one session to the other and would appreciate a 5-minute summary from each teacher at the beginning of each session, looking back at the previous content and linking it to what’s to come” [Lecturer D, Group 6]).

In the case where instruction is divided into longer periods (for instance, the groups switch co-teacher mid-semester), the following strategies were found to be helpful:

- Co-teacher 2 may comment on students’ feedback on the first part of the course, taught by Co-teacher 1. To make these comments more focused, one of the questions answered on the exit tickets could be, *What would you like from the second part of the course?*
- The introduction session to Block 2 could be planned to bridge the two blocks by explicitly reviewing the lessons learned in Block 1 as a way of activating students for the contents that will be taught in Block 2.

In all cases, lecturers should avoid content overflow into the other lecturer's classes. If this cannot be avoided, it is best to make sure the other instructor can teach that content. This point is clearly exemplified in the following quote of one of the lecturer's diaries:

However, in this week we continue a trend that started in the week before, which is carrying over content from one week to the other rather than finishing our units in each session. I feel that it is mostly me because I find managing the bimodal classroom difficult and my time management is not good. But the fact that Lecturer F sometimes has to cancel classes due to professional needs does not help much either. I think students find this confusing and definitely for next year I would very much like to design the classes in such a way as to ensure all content can be delivered in one session, with no overflow (Lecturer D, Group 6).

It is also very important to avoid going back and forth between one instructor's content and the other's. Students may interpret this in a negative way, either as a problem in coordination or of communication between lecturers.

In cases of **team teaching**, time management and redundancy in instructor explanations were two significant concerns. Co-teachers found that having two instructors explain contents and clarify questions often resulted in a slower pace and not being able to achieve the teaching objectives of the session ("Things tend to go slowly with two teachers explaining and clarifying, and sometimes I don't say something I would normally say so that we can move on" [Lecturer A, Group 1]). From a student perspective, as revealed in mid-semester exit tickets, team teaching can result in sessions that are too "intense" and therefore "hard to follow", especially when taught in a foreign language, which was the case in this innovation project. To address this potential caveat of team teaching, we recommend the following strategies:

- Carefully preplanning instructor roles, as suggested above.
- Making a conscious effort not to restate, or expand on, the other lecturer's initial explanation, unless this is explicitly requested by students. If so, a good policy is to have Co-teacher 2 answer questions on content initially explained by Co-teacher 1, and vice-versa.

4.3 Assessment

So far, the feedback collected from students suggests that they generally welcome the variety in teaching styles brought by co-teaching. An Education student reported in her

learning portfolio that “having different teachers for different parts of the subject was new, but also beneficial. We were able to learn from two different people at the same time, and that is nothing but enriching” (Custodio-Espinar et al., 2019).

At the same time, students are understandably sensitive to perceived differences or inconsistencies between the co-teachers’ evaluation criteria. In a focus group interview with Education students, participants agreed that one of the problems with co-teaching is that teachers do not necessarily value the different parts of an assignment in the same way. Further, they reported that “when asking for clarification [on the assignment], there would be occasional contradictions in the explanations of the different teachers ... you didn’t always see things the same way” (Custodio-Espinar et al., 2019). This problem has also been reflected in the lecturer diaries:

Concerning assessment, this week Lecturer F and I compared our assessment of one of the student presentations and noticed that he is far more meticulous than I am regarding two points: correctness of content (chronology, terminology) and documenting your sources/not reading from plagiarized material (Lecturer D, Group 6).

To ensure a fair assessment process, and reassure students before exams and when setting significant assignments, the following practices were found to be useful:

- Being especially transparent about the evaluation process. Providing advance notice about the evaluation criteria and tools (exam question types, rubrics, and checklists for assignments).
- Co-correcting the most important tasks. To save time and ensure fairness, co-teachers may wish to grade different sections or aspects of the exam or assignment.
- Joint revision whenever possible, especially sensitive cases (e.g., failing scores).
- When providing feedback as part of formative assessment (papers, presentations, etc.) lecturers should agree on (roughly) how much detail they will provide students.

4.4 Communication with students outside the classroom

As in the case of assessment, lecturers should, whenever possible, convey a united front before the students. It is understandable that some students feel more inclined to contact one of the two co-teachers – for instance, because they know her from a previous course – regarding questions of assessment, materials, or asking for support

when doing specific tasks. However, in order to ensure fairness and avoid misunderstandings with the students, and among the teaching team, it is advisable that co-teachers ensure transparency in their respective communication with the class. The following strategies were found helpful in this respect:

- Agreeing on the preferred single channel of communication, preferably supported by the university's digital campus (Moodle, in our case).
- Negotiating important decisions and criteria before confirming with the students.
- Copying each other in all academic communication with students, except for sensitive cases in which the students' initial message may require privacy.
- Signing messages to the whole group with both lecturers' names.
- Using the plural "we" to enhance both the students' and the instructors' perception of the co-teachers as a team.

4.5 Professional development

One of the sources of inspiration of this innovation project is the belief that co-teachers can improve their own individual teaching through the process of planning and delivering instruction with another colleague. For example, we have seen that co-teachers can learn more about digital resources from each other ("Instead of having to figure it out on our own, look through how-to videos or contact technical support, Lecturer B and I tend to ask if the other knows how to do something and we support each other" [Lecturer A, Group 5]). It has also become clear that methodology is often transferred when one co-teacher sees activities or presentation techniques planned by the other, and they use them in their other courses. To maximize this benefit, the following practices have proved valuable:

- Sharing materials in an online repository, preferably a cloud system such as Google Drive or MS OneDrive.
- In online scenarios, recording online classes. Having the sessions on video will facilitate processes of mutual observation and feedback.
- Sharing reflective diaries with the partner. This can provide many insights on methodology and improve individual teaching strategies.

- In **station teaching**, it is highly recommended that co-teachers arrange to teach together in the same classroom once or twice throughout the semester. This may be particularly valuable in introduction and review sessions, or when students share the results of an especially significant project.
- In **team teaching**, transfer of methodology will take place almost spontaneously. Still, it is a good idea that there is enough variety in the roles taken on by each co-teacher in different moments of the class, unit, or semester: leader, assistant, etc.

4.6 Affective aspects

Last, but certainly not least, attending to affective factors is critical to co-teaching being sustainable in the long run. In such a traditionally individualistic job as lecturing in higher education, implementing co-teaching can be not only organizationally, but also personally, challenging at different moments of the process. Some useful suggestions in this respect are:

- Using planning and review meetings to openly discuss feelings about how the co-teaching experience is going.
- Co-teaching relies on mutual respect among partners. Lecturers should, whenever possible, demonstrate this respect in front of students. For instance, one co-teacher can refer to her colleague's expertise or special knowledge of a topic.
- Sharing reflective diaries with the co-teacher can help provide positive reinforcement between colleagues.
- In **team teaching**, the affective elements could be incorporated into a "dialogic" presentation style, with one co-teacher playing the role of interviewer, and the second one of expert on a specific topic or experience.
- In **station teaching**, if schedules permit, both instructors should coincide in the classroom at key moments, for example for initial introductions, final review or student feedback sessions. This will demonstrate a united front, mutual respect and close coordination.
- Co-teachers should exercise a high degree of patience and flexibility. Co-teaching can have a steep learning curve in early stages of the process, and many adjustments will need time to be made.

5. Conclusions

The co-teaching project is ongoing and so far, extensive data has only been collected on the third of the objectives mentioned in Section 3: (3) Enriching the lecturer's experience, by means of the teacher diaries. Regarding this objective, feedback from instructors has been uniformly enthusiastic regarding professional development, positive reinforcement of self-image and improved student learning experience. Progress in the remaining two objectives, (1) Reduce redundancies in course contents and (2) Provide a wider vision of the contents to students, has been perceived from the lecturer's point of view, but it remains to be seen whether students' perceptions coincide. For this purpose, individual and focus group interviews will be carried out. Furthermore, lessons taught by all partnerships have been observed by project group members, and data collected by means of an observation template. This data will be analyzed to ascertain whether lecturer and student perceptions of classroom interactions are further substantiated by independent class observations. Once the reflection diaries, interviews and observation notes have been triangulated, results can be contrasted and will be more reliable.

In line with the results found thus far, the authors offer a few recommendations directed at institutional administration:

- **Ensuring that lecturers have an opportunity to meet** before, during and after their course. This could be achieved by checking schedule compatibilities, or by offering training sessions designed to provide time and space for collaboration.
- **Providing positive reinforcement** of the many advantages of co-teaching through direct communication by heads of department, training opportunities or incentives.
- **Clarifying the objectives of each co-teaching partnership**, such as: language partnerships (each lecturer provides expertise in one language/culture), or educator-professional partnerships (one instructor contributes professional experience in the field, for example as a translator, interpreter, primary school teacher; while the other contributes extensive teaching experience and availability to deal with administrative issues).

- In the case of **online delivery**, providing extensive training not only in the use of online tools but also in methodological changes that need to be made. Online experiences can be daunting for lecturers with little previous experiences and partnering with another instructor can be of great help.

In conclusion, for effective co-teaching to take place, all key players need to be on board: students, lecturers, heads of department, and the professional development department. Providing funding for teaching innovation projects can help lecturers coordinate and be a strong incentive to take risks, manage change, put in the extra effort and the extra hours in order to make the teaching and learning experience more effective and more gratifying.

Reference section

- Bacharach, N., Heck, T. W., & Dahlberg, K. (2008). Co-Teaching in higher education. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 5(3), 9-16. <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v5i3.1298>
- Blanchard, K. D. (2012). Modeling lifelong learning: Collaborative teaching across disciplinary lines. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 15(4), 338–354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9647.2012.00826.x>
- Carbone, A., Evans, J., Ross, B., Drew, S., Phelan, L., Lindsay, K., Cottman, C., Stoney, S., & Ye, J. (2017). Assessing distributed leadership for learning and teaching quality: A multi-institutional study. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, 39(2), 183–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1276629>
- Cook, L. & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 28(3), 1-16.
- Custodio-Espinar, M., Buckingham, L.R. & López-Hernández, A. (2019, May 31-June1). *Twice the teachers, twice the benefits? Helping CLIL trainee teachers develop collaborative competence through co-teaching* [Paper presentation]. III International conference for professionals in bilingual education, Madrid (Spain).
- Ferguson, J. & Wilson, J. (2011). The co-teaching professorship: Power and expertise in the co-taught higher education classroom. *Scholar-Practitioner Quarterly*, 5(1), 52-68. <https://cutt.ly/JpPTdcD>

- Graziano, K. J., & Navarrete, L. A. (2012). Co-Teaching in a teacher education classroom: Collaboration, compromise, and creativity. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 21(1), 109-126. <https://cutt.ly/FpPYRhT>
- Halbach, A. (2016). *Observation and Reflection: Tensions between best practice and reality*. IATEFL Signature Event [Video]. Youtube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kg3JlvBUl8s>
- Honigsfeld, A. & Dove, M. G. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching: Strategies for English learners*. Corwin.
- Lasagabaster, D., Doiz, A., & Pavón, V. (2019). Undergraduates' beliefs about the role of language and team teaching in EMI courses at university. *Rassegna Italiana di Linguistica Applicata*, 50(2-3), 111-127. <https://cutt.ly/8pPPNi5>
- Lock, J., Clancy, T., Lisella, R., Rosenau, P., Ferreira, C., & Rainsbury, J. (2016). The lived experiences of instructors co-teaching in higher education. *Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 26(1), 22-35. <https://doi.org/10.26522/brocked.v26i1.482>
- Montgomery, M. S. and Akerson, A. (2019). Facilitating collaboration through a co-teaching field experience. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.4148/2470-6353.1284>
- Morelock, J. R., Lester, M. M., Klopfer, M. D., Jardon, A. M., Mullins, R. D., Nicholas, E. L., & Alfaydi, A. S. (2017). Power, perceptions, and relationships: A model of co-teaching in higher education. *College Teaching*, 65(4), 182–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2017.1336610>
- Murphy, C., & Martin, S. N. (2015). Coteaching in teacher education: Research and practice. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 277-280. <https://cutt.ly/ApPSVma>
- Murphy, C., Scantlebury, K., & Milne, C. (2015). Using Vygotsky's zone of proximal development to propose and test an explanatory model for conceptualising coteaching in pre-service science teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 281-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2015.1060291>
- OECD. (2020). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume II): Teachers and School Leaders as Valued Professionals*. TALIS, OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/19cf08df-en>
- Pettit, S. L. (2017). Preparing teaching candidates for co-teaching. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 83(3), 15-23. <https://cutt.ly/fpPGbyx>

- Ricci, L. A., & Fingon, J. (2018). Experiences and perceptions of university students and general and special educator teacher preparation faculty engaged in collaboration and co-teaching practices. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 20(2). <https://cutt.ly/XpPGVRG>
- Simons, M., Baeten, M., & Vanhees, C. (2020). Team teaching during field experiences in teacher education: Investigating student teachers' experiences with parallel and sequential teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(1), 24–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487118789064>
- Turan, M., & Bayar, B. (2017). Examining teachers view on primary teaching practices based on co-teaching model. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(11), 82-97. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v5i11.2708>
- Universidad Pontificia Comillas (n.d.-a). *Mission and values*. Retrieved January 9, 2021, from <https://www.comillas.edu/en/university/about-us/mission-and-values>
- Universidad Pontificia Comillas (n.d.-b). *Universidad Pontificia Comillas en cifras 2019/2020*. Retrieved January 9, 2021, from https://www.comillas.edu/Documentos/Comillas_Cifras.pdf
- Voogt, J. & Roblin, N. P. (2012). A comparative analysis of international frameworks for 21st century competences: Implications for national curriculum policies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 44(3), 299-321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2012.668938>