Review of: "Transitioning to Hybrid Assessment: Reflections on Academic Assessment Practices Post-COVID-19"

Alberto Arnau[1]

1 Universidad Cardenal Herrera-CEU

Dear Gabriele Marinello Peer Review Team, Qeios

Thank you for giving me the chance to review this manuscript.

Title: Transitioning to Hybrid Assessment: Reflections on Academic Assessment Practices Post-COVID-19

Reviewer's comments

General Comments and overall evaluation:

The work addresses an interesting topic in higher education, such as hybrid assessment. However, it can be improved in several ways, especially in the structure of the text and the way information is presented.

The objectives are not specific enough. Consequently, it is not easy to find out whether the materials and methods are appropriate or not. For example, in the objectives, authors ponder four questions. However, they do not provide data from many of them in the results (e.g., there is only one assessment type in the hybrid system to answer the first question, so it is not possible to evaluate types of assessment to be implemented). In my opinion, there is one main objective, which is to test whether the hybrid system could replace the face-to-face system. This objective was addressed using two tools, the questionnaire offered to teachers (i) and the experiment with the marks of the students (ii).

The materials and methods are not properly structured. For example, there are four levels of headings and subheadings which make it difficult to relate them to the questionnaire and to the experiment. In the 3.3.3 section 'Evaluation modality,' it is not clear the differences between the control and experimental groups. I assume that the final exam was equal in both groups, but the mid-semester exam was different, being online for the hybrid group and face-to-face for the control group. I wonder if the questions were equal in both groups.

Results. Usually, statistical tests are included in the table of the average results, and the description of the test is included in the materials and methods. In section 4.2, page 12, it is compared the success rate between the control and experimental groups; however, no statistical information is provided for such a comparison. In section 4.3, it is not clear why taxonomic skills are evaluated in the hybrid assessment but not in the face-to-face scenario. Moreover, it is not clear where these data came from (Table 7). It seems that the data came from the MCQ test of the mid-semester, which aims at formative assessment, but it is not clear. Please clarify it in the materials and methods.

Conclusions and perspectives do not respond directly to the objectives and are not related to the information provided in the results.

Other comments:

At the end of the abstract, 'it is strongly recommended that adoption of hybrid assessment in higher education'. This sentence seems too strong regarding the information provided in the text.

The introduction is split into two sections named introduction and literature review. I think it would be clearer if they were merged. For example, I miss the definition of the hybrid system in the second paragraph of page 2, but it is defined in section 2.

What are the differences between blended and hybrid systems (page 3)? If they are synonyms, please unify the terms to make it easier for the reader.