

## *Learning Assessment in Blended Learning*

### *Avaliação da Aprendizagem no Ensino Híbrido*

Josiane Aparecida Baroto Pavão <sup>1\*</sup>  
Osmar Pedrochi Junior <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Pitágoras UNOPAR  
Rua Marselha, 591. Londrina, PR, Brasil.  
[\\*josiane.baroto@gmail.com](mailto:*josiane.baroto@gmail.com)

#### Abstract

The use of technologies in the school environment changes the way of learning and teaching, and, consequently, the way of assessing learning. Hybrid teaching has gained more and more space in the face of traditional teaching, seeking the appreciation of the student and the personalization of learning, merging the advantages of online teaching with the benefits of the traditional classroom. Thus, it is necessary to understand the concept of hybrid teaching, analyze its peculiarities and investigate how it is assessed in this type of teaching. Considering the existing gap when it comes to assessment in hybrid teaching and the need to deepen the theme, a survey has been conducted at the Brazilian Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (BDTD) of which were the most cited materials, starting from the research question: what are the characteristics of the assessment performed in hybrid teaching? The objective is to understand what type of evaluation is performed in this modality. The study demonstrates that the evaluation in the current way does not fulfill the role of assessing students' learning, it is primarily summative, evaluating only their performance and does not coincide with a reflexive teaching practice proposed by hybrid teaching.

**Keywords:** Assessment. Learning. Blended learning.



Received 05/03/2020  
Accepted 13/03/2021  
Published 18/03/2021

#### HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

**ABNT:** : PAVÃO, J. A. B.; PEDROCHI JUNIOR, O. Avaliação da Aprendizagem no Ensino Híbrido. **EaD em Foco**, v. 11, n. 1, e1104, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.18264/eadf.v11i1.1104>.

## Avaliação da Aprendizagem no Ensino Híbrido

### Resumo

*O uso das tecnologias no ambiente escolar altera a forma de aprender e ensinar, e, conseqüentemente, a forma de se avaliar. O ensino híbrido tem conquistado cada vez mais espaço frente ao ensino tradicional, buscando a valorização do aluno e a personalização da aprendizagem, mesclando as vantagens do ensino online com os benefícios da sala de aula tradicional. Assim, é necessário entender o conceito de ensino híbrido, analisar suas particularidades e investigar como se avalia nesta modalidade de ensino. Considerando a lacuna existente quando se trata de avaliação no ensino híbrido e a necessidade de aprofundar o tema, foi realizado um levantamento na Biblioteca Digital Brasileira de Teses e Dissertações (BDTD) de quais eram os materiais mais citados, partindo da pergunta de investigação: quais as características da avaliação realizada no ensino híbrido? O objetivo é entender qual (ou quais) tipo de avaliação é realizada nesta modalidade. O estudo demonstra que a avaliação nos moldes atuais não cumpre o papel de avaliar a aprendizagem dos alunos, ela é prioritariamente somativa, avaliando apenas seu rendimento e não coincide com uma prática de ensino reflexivo proposta pelo ensino híbrido.*

**Palavras-chave:** Avaliação. Aprendizagem. Ensino híbrido.

## 1. Introduction

Hybrid teaching has as one of its characteristics the appreciation of the student and the personalization of learning. This modality has gained more and more space in the face of traditional teaching and its growth can be observed in the situation of semi-face-to-face presented in the census data of the Association of Distance Education (ABED). In 2013/2014 there were 447 semi-face-to-face courses offered in Brazil, and 190,564 (one hundred and ninety thousand, five hundred and sixty-four) enrollments in semi-face-to-face courses (ABED, 2014) were registered. In 2017, 3,041 courses were offered and in 2018 there was a jump to 7,458 courses. In 2018, 2,109,951 (two million hundred and nine thousand nine hundred and fifty-one) enrolled in semi-face-to-face courses were counted, almost double the previous census (ABED, 2019)

Data from the ABED 2013/2014 and 2018/2019 census show a massive increase, in a period of 5 years, in the semi-face-to-face courses offered by Higher Education Institutions in Brazil. Considering that hybrid teaching is conquering its space in the face of traditional teaching, it is necessary to understand its concept, characteristics and how it is evaluated in this modality.

Hybrid teaching is taken in this work as “[...] any formal educational program in which a student learns, at least in part, through online teaching, with some element of student control over time, place, path, and rhythm” (HORN; STAKER 2015, p.34). Horn and Staker (2015, p. 57), point out that “learning online means a major instructional change from basically face-to-face teaching to those who use instruction and web-based content”, i.e., in DE or semi-face-to-face (hybrid) courses. However, the authors do not go deeper into the evaluative practices related to hybrid teaching, in view of this, a gap on the subject is evident. However, understanding the characteristics of the assessment in this modality is essential for institutions to plan pedagogical and curricular actions in a sustainable way in view of their growth.

## 1. Introduction

The study was based on Bardin's Content Analysis (2011), and analyzed materials from the same theme, from different authors, seeking to interpret materials published in the last 10 years on assessment in hybrid teaching. To reach the analyzed material, an advanced search was carried out in the Brazilian Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations (BDTD) of which were the most cited materials by the authors, considering the proposed objective: to investigate the characteristics of assessment in hybrid teaching. The titles relevant to the theme were selected and known. Analyzing the references of these materials, it was found that some books and authors were common in research. Among them "Blended: using disruptive innovation to improve education" (HORN; STAKER 2015), and "Hybrid Teaching" (BACICH; TANZI NETO; TREVISANI, 2015) and "Educating in the Digital Age" (BATES, 2016), and consequently began to make up the corpus.

The research was organized "around three chronological poles: 1) pre-analysis; 2) the exploration of the material and 3) treatment of results, inference and interpretation" (BARDIN, 2011, p. 123).

In the pre-analysis, the documents to be submitted to the analysis were organized and chosen, at this moment indicators were elaborated to support the interpretation. For this, the floating reading was made, demarcations were made of the items to be analyzed, the formulation of hypotheses and objectives and the referencing through clippings of selected texts and documents.

The second stage was the exploration of the material that can be interpreted as the analytical phase of the collected corpus, subjecting the material to an in-depth study, based on hypotheses, objectives and theoretical bases. Thus, many times, reinterpretations and reinterpretations were necessary that caused other inferences and allowed a theoretical deepening in the chosen theme. This "coming and going" is part of the qualitative analysis, which according to Bardin (2011, p. 144), "corresponds to a more intuitive procedure, but also more malleable and more adaptable to unforeseen indexes, or to the evolution of hypotheses". It is not associated with numbers but rather interpretations.

The interpretation of the data was constituted in the phase of analytical description in connection with the theoretical references. Inference was the intermediate procedure between description and interpretation, the moment to deduce logically, considering propositions already accepted as true. "This deductive or inferential process from indexes or indicators is not uncommon in scientific practice" (BARDIN, 2011, p. 47).

After going through the stages of analysis, interpretation and inference, this text is the result of the study.

## 3. Hybrid teaching

### 3.1 Legislation

To understand hybrid teaching, it is important, in addition to understanding its concept, to systematize the legislation relevant to Distance Education, especially with regard to the proposal of inclusion of DE subjects in face-to-face undergraduate courses, since hybrid teaching considers complementary the two learning environments: the traditional physical classroom and the online space.

The Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (Law No. 9,394 of December 20, 1996), established the legal bases of Distance Education in Brazil, which, from then on, began to be recognized as a modality. Currently, there is a vast legislation that regulates and provides for its practice. They are laws, normative ordinances and decrees, some already repealed, that regulate DE in Brazil.

Decree No. 2,494 of February 10, 1998 regulated Article 80 of the LDB, conceptualizing Distance Education as:

a form of teaching that enables self-learning through the mediation of educational resources, systematically organized, presented in different information media, used alone or combined and conveyed by the various media (BRASIL, 1998).

However, it is worth mentioning that the use of semi-face-to-face activities in face-to-face courses of the HEI were only regulated in 2001 through the ordinance of the Ministry of Education (MEC) no. 2,253 of October 18, 2001. And that, in 2004, this ordinance was repealed, with the publication of MEC ordinance No. 4,059, of December 10, 2004, authorizing the HEIs to include, in the pedagogical and curricular organization of recognized higher education courses, up to 20% (twenty percent) of the total workload of regularly authorized face-to-face undergraduate courses, the provision of subjects in the distance modality, incorporating the integrated use of information and communication technologies to achieve pedagogical objectives, providing face-to-face meetings and mentoring activities. This ordinance presented the concept of semi-face-to-face teaching, which was extremely important to avoid interpretative misunderstandings in its practice. This ordinance was repealed by Ordinance No. 1,134 of October 10, 2016, which established new guidelines for the theme, dealing with the provision of distance disciplines, within 20% of the workload, in face-to-face undergraduate courses.

In December 2018, Ordinance 1,428 was published, providing, by HEI, subjects in the distance modality in face-to-face undergraduate courses. This ordinance extended from 20% (twenty percent) to 40% (forty percent) the total workload of undergraduate courses in person. Ordinance 2,117, of December 6, 2019 repealed Ordinance No. 1,428 and had on the offer of workload of 40% in the modality of DE in face-to-face courses, in article 5, that the distance workload should be widely informed to students already enrolled and to the enters, in the latter case, being disclosed in the selection processes. For both, the contents, disciplines, methodologies and forms of assessment to be offered should be informed objectively. That is, the legislation recognizes the importance of assessment in this learning teaching process and stresses that the ways of evaluating themselves should be well defined and clear for students.

### 3.2 Literature

The term “hybrid” relates to the mixing movement, translated from blended English. It merges classroom and virtual teaching, inside and outside the classroom, and has been gaining significant space in world education, as Highlighted by Horn and Staker (2015), stating that this modality has already consolidated itself as one of the most important trends of education in the 21st century, aiming to unite the best characteristics of face-to-face teaching and online learning resources to promote improvements and new opportunities for education.

Horn, horn, horn. Staker (2015) state that “hybrid teaching is the engine that can make student-centered learning possible for students around the world, rather than just a privileged few” (HORN; STAKER, 2015, p. 54). To Bacich et al. (2015), these elements, present in hybrid teaching, favor work with active methodologies, increasingly enriching the autonomous participation of the student in class.

Valente (2015) contextualizes that computerization allowed the focus of activities to pass to students, which allows them to achieve independence by assuming a more participative posture in their learning process, being the main actor in the construction of their knowledge, and it is up to the teacher to be the mediator of the activities in this process.

Horn and Staker (2015) emphasize that implementing student-centered learning is a major challenge, but extremely important, considering that one of the characteristics of hybrid education is that students develop their autonomy and ownership of their progress and consequently conduct their own learning.

According to Moran (2015), hybrid teaching integrates classroom activities with digital, face-to-face with virtual activities. He argues that “what technology brings today is the integration of all spaces and times” (MORAN, 2015, p. 39). That is, “teaching and learning take place in a symbiotic, deep and constant inter-connection between the so-called physical and digital world” (MORAN, 2015, p. 39).

Moran (2015, p. 27) conceptualizes hybrid education as:

Hybrid means merged, mixed, blended. Education has always been mixed, hybrid, has always combined various spaces, times, activities, methodologies, public. This process, now with mobility and connectivity, is much more noticeable, broad and profound: it is a more open and creative ecosystem.

Bacich, *et. al.* (2015, p. 52) defend that:

We can consider that these two learning environments, the traditional classroom and the virtual space, gradually become complementary. This is because, in addition to the use of various digital technologies, the individual interacts with the group, intensifying the exchange of experiences that occurs in a physical environment, the school.

Tori (2009, p.121), already advocated the complementarity between these two environments, and foresaw a massive evolution of this way of teaching and learning when talking about hybrid teaching and its first steps:

Two learning environments that have historically developed separately, the traditional classroom and the modern virtual learning environment, have been discovering each other complementary. The result of this meeting are hybrid courses that seek to take advantage of what is advantageous in each modality, considering context, cost, pedagogical adequacy, educational objectives and student profiles.

Analyzing the evolution of virtual learning, proposed by Tori (2009), and the forecast contained in Ordinance No. 1,428, which provides for the offer, by HEI, of subjects in the distance modality, extending from 20% (twenty percent) to 40% (forty percent) of the total workload of undergraduate courses in person, it can be seen that this future has already arrived, or is very close.

In this context, Valente (2014), argues that the use of digital information and communication technologies (ICT), are extremely important for the educational field and explains that this plurality of terms: web-based education, online education, virtual classroom, distributed, e-learning, blended, hybrid teaching, exist because we are in a transition phase. In Brazil, hybrid teaching also receives the name of bi-modal, b-learning, semi-face-to-face, or mixed teaching. There is also no consensus in the literature regarding the classification of hybrid education: whether it is a modality, a methodology, a model or a format.

BATES (2017, p. 369) states that:

Online learning, blended learning, flipped lessons, hybrid learning, flexible learning, open learning and distance learning are all terms that are often used in place of each other, but there are considerable differences in their meanings.

For Bates (2017), blended learning, or hybrid teaching encompasses a variety that includes many styles, including technology-aided learning, the use of virtual learning environments to support classroom classes, store teaching materials, organize online readings and discussions, the use of capturing classes for inverted classrooms; semi-face-to-face courses. It highlights that hybrid or flexible learning requires the redesign of teaching, enabling students to study most of their time online, addressing the school environment for specific classes, such as laboratories or practical work that cannot be performed online. This redesign of face-to-face classes using technology enables hybrid learning, which combines online learning and face-to-face interactions. In these projects, classroom classes are reduced allowing students a longer online study time. "In hybrid learning, the entire learning experience is redesigned, with the transformation of face-to-face teaching around the use of technology" (BATES, 2017, p. 371).

In this sense, Brito (2020) points out that "[...] a good instructional design project is extremely important, since, in each pedagogical action, it is necessary to ensure the greatest and best use, both of the virtual and face-to-face environment".

Sunaga and Carvalho (2015), sharing this concept, affirm that with digital technologies it is possible to customize teaching through the use of intelligent platforms, transforming mass education into one that allows the student to learn at his or her pace and according to the knowledge previously acquired. They offer personalized activities, allowing each to learn in their own time. "This also allows the customization of assessments, in which each student tests their skills according to their level of knowledge" (SUNAGA; CARVALHO, 2015, p. 143).

According to Silva and Camargo, (2015 p. 175), "Hybrid models use emerging technologies to establish new configurations of learning forms." They clarify that the acceleration of technological development has emphatically accentuated the essentially changing aspect of contemporary culture, which implies that the current teaching model no longer corresponds to the realities and needs of today's cultural social context.

This trend, presented by Sunaga e Carvalho (2015) and Silva e Camargo (2015) incorporating emerging technologies, allows students to learn in such a way that they would not be able in an exclusively physical environment, or without the use of digital technologies.

For Bates (2017, p. 381),

online learning, in the form of hybrid teaching, must be deliberately introduced and gradually expanded as students attend a program, so that by the time they graduate, they have the necessary skills to continue learning independently, a fundamental skill in the digital age.

Horn and Staker (2015) warn of a very common misconception related to hybrid teaching and explain that it is very confused with technology-enriched teaching, but, "the infusion of technology in school environments is not necessarily synonymous with hybrid teaching" (HORN; STAKER, 2015, p. 54). These misconceptions happen, since "hybrid teaching is still in the first "confusing" stages of its development, schools are thinking about it in hundreds of ways as they experience what is best for them" (HORN; STAKER, 2015, p. 37).

Thus, it is not enough to install computers to implement hybrid teaching, it is necessary to adjust the pedagogical model for the proper use of technologies. "One must have a redoubled attention to avoid the misunderstanding of judging that any technological innovation is necessarily a pedagogical innovation" (MILL 2010 apud MARTINS 2016, p. 23). Integrating digital technologies into the curriculum requires a reflection on this process: it is necessary to understand the role of the student and teacher, understand the formative role of assessment, the organization of the school space and the contributions of digital technologies in the personalization of teaching.

Brito (2020, p.6), argues that:

Since it is presumed that it is the pedagogical method that identifies the type of teaching, then, it is reasonable to think that the simple mixture of the face-to-face environment with the virtual environment is not enough to characterize teaching as a hybrid. And, therefore, we could talk about the existence of three types of teaching that make (or can make) use of mixtures of pedagogical environments. I.e.:

- Face-to-face teaching, with interventions and moments in a virtual environment;
- Distance learning, with interventions and face-to-face moments;
- Hybrid teaching, with all pedagogical actions in mixed environment, resulting from face-to-face and virtual environments.

Horn and Staker (2015), present hybrid proposals for the integrated use of digital technologies in school culture, and clarify that it is not necessary to leave everything behind to insert current technologies in the classroom, it is possible to take advantage of the best of face-to-face and virtual, and the use of these technologies can be integrated into the curriculum. For Horn and Staker (2015) hybrid education, it is a sustained innovation, their initiatives lead to improvements in the established model, improving the traditional classroom. It differs from a disruptive innovation, because these are on their way to replacing the established model, completely disrupt the traditional approach, are prone to adopt a whole new way of thinking, seeking to transform schooling into a personalized system, based on accessible and economic competence. Thus, it is important to highlight that despite having disruptive characteristics as a whole, hybrid technologies do not move towards disruptive teaching. "Hybrid models are supported for the conventional classroom, while disruptive models are prepared to replace it with another totally different paradigm" (HORN; STAKER, 2015, p. 70).

In this sense, hybrid teaching represents a combination between the old and the new, mixing the best of both worlds, that is, "the hybrid model is traditional in the sense that it does not break down walls, does not alienate face-to-face teacher or radically change the student's programming flow. At the same time, it is new because it uses online teaching as a way to transmit content" (HORN; STAKER, 2015, p. 71). Summarizing hybrid teaching is a sustained innovation and seeks to better serve students in the traditional classroom, its implementation with quality can bring significant improvements to learning.

Valente (2014) by quoting Moran (2014) emphasizes that:

The combination of what happens online with what happens in the classroom in person can be very rich and benefit students' learning in all respects. The use of blended learning has been the trend in many DE courses. In Brazil, Moran believes that this is the modality that can introduce changes in classroom teaching and in distance-held subjects or courses. According to this author, "Institutions will use blended as the predominant model of education, which will unite face-to-face and DE. Face-to-face courses will become semi-face-to-face, especially in the more adult phase of education, such as university courses" (MORAN, 2014 apud VALENTE, 2014, p. 85).

Bates (2017) states that such benefits have already been proven, and cites a major meta-analysis of research on hybrid and online teaching conducted for the U.S. Department of Education, reporting that:

In recent experimental and near-experimental studies that have compared conventional classroom classes with combinations of online and face-to-face teaching, hybrid teaching has proven to be more effective, providing a foundation for the effort needed to design and implement hybrid approaches. When used by itself, online learning seems to be as effective as conventional classroom teaching, but no more (BATES, 2017, p. 376).

Bates (2017) clarifies that, even in the face of quality research, there is little evidence or theory to guide or affirm about what is best done online and what is best done in person in the context of hybrid learning. What can be affirmed is that, given the studies analyzed and research conducted, hybrid teaching has contributed significantly to the learning of students and personalization of teaching.

Hybrid teaching models also provide personalized teaching. This makes it possible to know the level of difficulty of each student individually or in a group, and is an activity that, if used through technology, allows a very specific educational service for each student or group without overloading the teacher (MIRANDA, et al., p. 5, 2020).

In hybrid, the use of technologies enables a personalized and autonomous teaching. Given this, teachers need to be multitasking to help their students learn, they should be fewer speakers and more mentors, guiding and motivating the student to plot their own learning project. Both must assume new roles in this new scenario and understand that this change is crucial to promote learning, since "hybrid teaching is a methodological combination that impacts on the action in the teaching teacher and on the action of students in learning situations" (BACIH, et. al., 2015, p. 52).

Horn and Staker (2015) argue that by using online teaching the student can learn at any time, at any pace and path. That technology provides students with different paths to reach the same level of knowledge, at the same destination, and that it can free teachers to be planners, mentors, facilitators, evaluators and tutors, allowing them to better serve students with difficulties, having more time to analyze the needs of each, providing individual instructions or in small groups.

Lima and Moura (2015), explain that even with the presence of multimedia in the classroom the way to teach, learn and evaluate little has changed. That digital technologies have changed little pedagogical practices and that "hybrid teaching aims to build an innovative pedagogical practice that enhances students' learning through digital technologies" (LIMA; MOURA, 2015, p. 91). They state that the use of technologies does not diminish the importance of teachers, but changes their role. In this context,

the teacher is an architect of knowledge and needs to show the student that there are different ways to build knowledge. The use of technology serves as a very diversified fuel of tools that can stimulate and facilitate the learning process, and it is up to the teacher to teach the student to use them critically and productively. [...] The school today needs to be redesigned, and the teacher needs to change along with the student. [...] You have to innovate. Motivate. Enchant. Inspire. One of the paths to this change is to seek pedagogical differentiation practices. It is no longer up to teach all students as if we were teaching one (LIMA; MOURA, 2015, p. 91).

This is also the position advocated by Moran (2015) in defending that the role of the teacher, as a designer and architect in the construction of knowledge, is decisive and must be carried out in a different and



innovative way. For Moran (2015), the teacher becomes increasingly a manager and advisor of collective and individual paths, in a more open, creative and entrepreneurial construction and the proactivity of students is related to engaging methodologies, with decision-making, new experiments instigating them to new initiatives.

This is also the position advocated by Moran (2015) in defending that the role of the teacher, as a designer and architect in the construction of knowledge, is decisive and must be carried out in a different and innovative way. For Moran (2015), the teacher becomes increasingly a manager and advisor of collective and individual paths, in a more open, creative and entrepreneurial construction and the proactivity of students is related to engaging methodologies, with decision-making, new experiments instigating them to new initiatives (MIRANDA, et al., p. 4, 2020).

Bates (2017, p. 381), highlighting the importance of hybrid teaching for students says that “the benefit for students is greater flexibility, but they will still have to be relatively close to campus in order to attend face-to-face sessions.” These face-to-face sessions cover assessment, which should be face-to-face.

According to Santos (2015, p.108), “we can see that the education system has sought to adapt to this re-signification of the school space. From massification we pass the personalization of teaching”, the student ceases to be an spectator and begins to occupy an autonomous role in this new scenario. Students and teachers are side by side in this process, each fulfilling their role to achieve personalized learning. Hybrid teaching, for Santos (2015, p.110), “inserts technology in the school space, without the need to tear down walls, but breaking the old ways of seeing teaching” [...] “it acts as a bridge between the structure of school space that we have for a future major eruption in this space”.

When the teacher strives to see the classroom as a different environment from the one for which it was designed, it is causing a small disruption in the current teaching model” (SANTOS, 2015, p. 117). The teacher is free to choose the best way to work and evaluate their students to achieve learning. Transforming the classroom into a hybrid environment, supported by the use of digital technologies and performing an assessment with formative action can be the first step to leave massification and set out on a path towards the personalization of teaching.

#### 4. Assessment in hybrid education

Over the past few years, online learning has gained ample space in the educational sector. Consequently, hybrid teaching offers are also on the rise due to their flexibility, ease of access, integration of technologies, among the many benefits and resources offered by this type of teaching. However, much is said about hybrid teaching, its benefits and contributions to learning, but little is said about how it is evaluated in this modality that mixes classroom and virtual teaching. In addition, Lima and Moura (2015) as mentioned earlier, explain that even with the presence of multimedia in the classroom the way of teaching, learning and evaluating little has changed. Which seems to be incoherent and contradictory to the hybrid teaching proposal advocated by Bacich, et. Al. (2015), when presenting a system of gear in hybrid education in which the student is at the center of this gear, but that, in order for its effectiveness and operation to work, it is necessary a shared work, evolving other points, among them the assessment.

School practices should be rethought so that these points are also adjusted for the construction of a school focused on learning. One of these points that need transformation is the assessment, because the system currently adopted, of only ranking knowledge, selecting qualified/approved students or not is incompatible with the flexibility proposed by hybrid education.

For Rodrigues (2015 p. 124) “assessment is an inseparable part of a flexible teaching practice, as required by the hybrid teaching model”. The assessment lacks resignification: the classification method and tests are no longer enough. It is necessary to adopt the diagnostic and prognostic function of the assessment, if there is really the intention of rethinking and modernizing the school environment. “It is necessary to advance on the very interface on which the assessment is presented” (RODRIGUES, 2015 p. 124). The assessment, according to this author, falls short of its true potential, it must overcome the binary logic of approval/disapproval and be used as an instrument of adjustment, of reorganization of pedagogical practice, prioritizing the relationship between students and teachers as a way to verify the gaps in the learning process that can be adjusted and overcome, positioning the assessment as a guide of learning and, not only as verification, and tests for the purpose of ranking income. It should have the focus of verifying student learning, and the feedback process should serve as a reorientation, and together with other learning verification components to meet students’ demands to achieve the best of their potential. This assessment is crucial for the personalization of hybrid education.

Without the assessment the whole process of personalized teaching is limited... [...] it should not only be focused on the student, so that it is possible to verify learning and return solutions, but also needs to be a constant part of the teaching relationship. It is through the results of the assessments – properly oriented to what one wishes to achieve – that customization can be carried out (RODRIGUES, 2015, p.128).

Hybrid teaching is not differentiated exclusively by mixing educational modalities, which until some time ago, walked separately, but by the way they relate and the broad benefits of this mixture. The option to adopt this modality requires careful planning, whose methodological strategies involve several points including assessment. “The change of focus of the assessment is, therefore, a complex work and of great ramifications” (RODRIGUES, 2015, p.129). Placing the student at the center of the education process and consequently the assessment requires changes in the assessment process. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the use of technology and explore it productively, since it is a facilitator, and through it, the assessment can be very diverse, and even carried out in real time through software, virtual learning environments (VLE) and digital platforms. “With the flexibility of technology, the way to evaluate is that one should adapt to the student and the desired development, and not the other way around” (RODRIGUES, 2015, p.131).

Silva and Camargo (2015 p.183), corroborate this positioning of Rodrigues (2015) and highlight that “the innovative character of blended enhances the results and allows a better assessment of the teacher on the real learning situation of the student and the paths to be followed, respecting the rhythm, skills and competencies of the students...”

It is important to know the progress of students during each stage of the process and understand if the learning objectives are being achieved. After all, “assessment is not an end. Evaluating is a process” (MARTINS, 2016, p. 61). And, throughout this process, it is necessary to adjust and replan the educational action, in which the personalization of teaching becomes one of the objectives of assessment as a process. The use of the technologies used during the process provides conditions for a formative assessment, offering strategies to accompany the student while learning occurs, understanding and adjusting misconceptions, identifying errors and advances, and enabling feedback. Thus, students and teachers, together they can outline their learning process, defining the tools and aspects such as time, place, and the way they most identify with their best way of learning, since these aspects are relevant in the personalization of teaching (MARTINS 2016).

Rodrigues (2015, 131), defends,

that from these results, an adjustment to the method can be made, rhythm, in short, an adaptation to the best path to be followed by each student. Even if a huge number of results are produced, reflecting on them is feasible.

Bacich et al, (2015, p.144) concluded that “there is no way to guarantee that all students present are actually learning and understanding the messages that the teacher wishes to teach”. However, we understand that through formative assessment, certainly the actions of teaching learning can be enhanced, besides enabling the offer of feedback, moments of collaboration, self-assessment, strengthening more affective relationships between students and teachers.

Martins (2016), emphasizes that the hybrid approach, in addition to associating online resources with face-to-face teaching, involves a reorganization and reconceptualization of learning, i.e.,

teacher-centric learning for student-centered learning... a student interaction with each other and between them and the resources that enable learning, and a results-centric assessment for process-centric assessment (MARTINS, 2016. p. 72).

Process-centered evaluation is characteristic of formative assessment, essential in hybrid teaching because it is student-centered, enabling them to gain their autonomy, reflect on their learning, planning and adjusting, together with the teacher, the path to their personalized learning.

## 5. Conclusions

The study was carried out from the analysis of the contents of studies related to hybrid teaching and its evaluative practices. It evidenced gaps that can be explored in future research. The opportunity to give hybrid education, in a planned way, still seems to be a great challenge for schools and teachers. In this sense, it was possible to envision a field of research linking the use of technologies in teaching with evaluative practices/methodologies.

The literature shows that the evaluation is still primarily summative and points out the need for a new way of evaluating. The assessment in the current way, does not fulfill the role of evaluating the learning of students, only their performance, and does not coincide with a reflexive teaching practice proposed by hybrid teaching.

The studies also show that hybrid teaching contributes a lot with alternatives for teaching, with positive impacts on the learning process, but that these innovative actions involve only teaching, leaving aside to evaluate, as if both, were not complementary. Many institutions have implemented or are implementing hybrid models, but nothing has innovated their way of evaluating.

It is not enough to install computers, or access to virtual platforms, to implement hybrid teaching, it is necessary to adjust the pedagogical model for the proper use of technologies. “One must have a redoubled attention to avoid the misunderstanding of judging that any technological innovation is necessarily a pedagogical innovation” (MILL 2010 apud MARTINS 2016, p. 23). Integrating digital technologies into the curriculum requires reflection on this process: it is necessary to understand the role of the student and teacher, understand the role of assessment, and the contributions of digital technologies in the personalization of teaching.

The evaluation, whether income or learning, is a complex process, and should be studied, because, in a general sense, the assessment could be defined as the management of the probable and according to Hadji (1994, p.21), "to assess is to carry out an analysis of the situation and an assessment of the probable consequences of its act in such a situation".

Even in view of the size of the growth of hybrid or semi-face-to-face teaching, the way to evaluate, to analyze, to appreciate in this modality, still seems not to have its own characteristics, now being adopted the standards of classroom teaching, now the standards of the DE.

## References

- ABED. **Associação Brasileira de Educação a Distância**. Censo EaD.BR: relatório analítico da aprendizagem a distância no Brasil. São Paulo: Pearson Education do Brasil 2013/2014. Available at: <[http://www.abed.org.br/censoead2013/CENSO\\_EAD\\_2013](http://www.abed.org.br/censoead2013/CENSO_EAD_2013). Accessed in:12/03/2020.
- ABED. **Associação Brasileira de Educação a Distância**. Censo EAD.BR: relatório analítico da aprendizagem a distância no Brasil 2018 Curitiba: InterSaberes, 2019. Available at: [http://abed.org.br/arquivos/CENSO\\_DIGITAL\\_EAD\\_2018\\_PORTUGUES.pdf](http://abed.org.br/arquivos/CENSO_DIGITAL_EAD_2018_PORTUGUES.pdf). Accessed in:12/03/2020.
- BARDIN, L. **Análise de Conteúdo**. 1ª edição. ed. São Paulo: Edições 70, 2011.
- BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. de M. Ensino Híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação. In:(Org.). **Ensino Híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação**. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015.
- BATES, T. **Educar na era digital [livro eletrônico]: design, ensino e aprendizagem**. 1. ed. São Paulo: Artesanato Educacional, 2017.
- BRASIL. **Decreto nº 2.494/98 de 10 de fevereiro de 1998**. Available at: /<http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesu/arquivos/pdf/dec2494.pdf>>. Accessed in: may. 2020.
- BRASIL. **Portaria de nº 2253 de 18 de outubro de 2001**. Available at: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesuBRASIL>. Accessed in: may. 2020.
- BRASIL. **Portaria 4059, de 10 de dezembro de 2004**. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesuBRASIL>. Accessed in: may. 2020.
- BRASIL. **Portaria de nº 1134 de 10 de outubro de 2016**. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesu>. Accessed in: may. 2020.
- BRASIL. **Portaria nº 1.428 de 28 de dezembro de 2018**. Disponível em: <http://portal.mec.gov.br/sesu>. Accessed in: mar. 2020.
- BRASIL. **Portaria nº 2.117 de 6 de dezembro de 2019**. Disponível em <http://www.in.gov.br/en/web/dou/-/portaria-n-2.117-de-6-de-dezembro-de-2019-232670913> Accessed in: may. 2020.
- BRITO, M. S.; A Singularidade Pedagógica do Ensino Híbrido. **EaD em Foco**, V10, e948. 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18264/eadf.v10i1948>
- HADJI, C. **Avaliação, regras do jogo**. Das Intenções aos Instrumentos. 4ª edição. ed. Porto: Porto Editora, 1994.
- HORN, M. B.; STAKER, H. **Blended: usando a inovação disruptiva para aprimorar a educação**. Tradução: Maria Cristina Gularte Monteiro. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015.
- LIMA, L. H. F; MOURA, F. R. O professor no Ensino Híbrido. In BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. (Org.). **Ensino híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação**. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015 (89-102).

- MARTINS, L. C. B. **Implicações da organização da atividade didática com uso de tecnologias digitais na formação de conceitos em uma proposta de Ensino Híbrido.**317f. Tese (Doutorado em Psicologia) - Instituto de Psicologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2016.
- MIRANDA, R. V. *et al.* Ensino Híbrido: Novas Habilidades Docentes Mediadas pelos Recursos Tecnológicos. **EaD em Foco**, V10, e913. 2020. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18264/eadf.v10i913>
- MORAN, J. M. Educação Híbrida: um conceito-chave para a educação hoje. In: BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. de M. (Org.). **Ensino Híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação.** Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015
- RODRIGUES, E. F. A avaliação e a tecnologia. In BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. (Org.). **Ensino híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação.** Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015 (123-137).
- SANTOS, G. S. Espaços de aprendizagem. In BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. (Org.). **Ensino híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação.** Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015 (103-120).
- SILVA, R. A.; CAMARGO, A. L. O impacto da aceleração tecnológica na relação professor-aluno, no currículo e na organização escolar. In BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. (Org.). **Ensino híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação.** Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015 (169-188).
- SUNAGA, A.; CARVALHO, C. S. As tecnologias digitais no ensino híbrido. In BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. (Org.). **Ensino híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação.** Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015 (141-154).
- TORI, R. Cursos híbridos ou blended learning. In: FORMIGA, M e LITTO, F. **Educação a Distância: o estado da arte.** São Paulo: Pearson Education, 2009.
- VALENTE, J. A. **Blended learning e as mudanças no ensino superior: a proposta da sala de aula invertida.** Educ. rev. no. Spe4. Curitiba 2014.
- VALENTE, J. A. Prefácio. In BACICH, L.; TANZI NETO, A.; TREVISANI, F. M. (Org.). **Ensino híbrido: personalização e tecnologia na educação.** Porto Alegre: Penso, 2015.