Jurnal Guru Dikmen dan Diksus
Volume 8 Number 2, 2025. Page 135-142
p-ISSN: 2655-481x, e-ISSN: 2723-6404

Webinar Festival as an Innovation in Collaborative Assessment for Project Based Learning

Sitti Khasanah
SMKN 1 Saptosari

Email: sikhaaphp@gmail.com

(Received: June 10, 2022; Accepted: October 25, 2022; Published: December 30, 2025)

ABSTRACT

The expansion of digital communication and the experience of pandemic-era online learning have created opportunities to redesign assessment in vocational education. This conceptual-practice article describes a webinar festival as an innovative collaborative summative-assessment technique for Project-Based Learning (PjBL) in vocational high schools and identifies its implementation challenges. The model integrates assessment by productive and general subjects—including language, civics, informatics, mathematics, entrepreneurship, and integrated science—around a shared student project. Students present project products through a webinar series, while teachers and invited experts provide feedback using agreed criteria. The design aligns assessment with authentic project performance, communication, collaboration, technological literacy, and public presentation. Its principal challenges concern learner autonomy, digital competence, coordination among teachers, preparation of presenters and moderators, stable internet access, and data availability. The webinar-festival model therefore offers a practical framework for reducing fragmented subject-based tasks while making project outcomes visible to a wider audience. Further empirical research should test common rubrics, inter-rater reliability, student workload, learning outcomes, and equity of digital access.

Keywords: collaborative assessment; Project-Based Learning; vocational education; webinar; summative assessment

INTRODUCTION

Vocational education increasingly requires learning experiences that connect disciplinary knowledge with authentic production, communication, problem solving, and collaboration. Project-Based Learning (PjBL) is particularly relevant because students investigate meaningful problems and produce publicly shareable artifacts rather than completing disconnected exercises (Krajcik & Blumenfeld, 2006; Bell, 2010; Kokotsaki et al., 2016; Guo et al., 2020). Research also associates well-designed project learning with deeper engagement, collaboration, self-regulation, and the integration of knowledge and practice (Condliffe et al., 2017; Chen & Yang, 2019; Almulla, 2020; Markula & Aksela, 2022).

Assessment, however, can remain fragmented when each vocational, adaptive, and general subject assigns separate tasks. Contemporary assessment scholarship emphasizes alignment between intended

learning outcomes, authentic performance, transparent criteria, feedback, and opportunities for students to use assessment information (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Boud & Molloy, 2013; Carless & Boud, 2018; Panadero et al., 2018; Wiliam, 2011). Collaborative assessment around a single project can therefore reduce duplication while enabling several teachers to judge different dimensions of the same performance.

Digital platforms extend this possibility by allowing project outcomes to be presented synchronously to teachers, peers, parents, and external experts. Studies of online and blended learning show that interaction, social presence, facilitation, and purposeful technology use are central to meaningful participation (Garrison et al., 2000; Martin & Bolliger, 2018; Rapanta et al., 2020; Bond et al., 2021). Webinars can function not merely as delivery channels but as public performance spaces where students explain products, respond to questions, and receive feedback. The present article therefore describes the webinar festival as a collaborative summative-assessment innovation for PjBL at the vocational-school level and examines the practical challenges involved.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Project-Based Learning and Authentic Performance

PjBL is grounded in learner-centered inquiry, sustained investigation, collaboration, and the production of an artifact or solution. Effective implementation requires a challenging question, student voice, iterative inquiry, feedback, and a public product (Thomas, 2000; Blumenfeld et al., 1991; Larmer et al., 2015). Meta-analytic and review evidence indicates positive effects when projects are carefully scaffolded and aligned with curricular goals (Chen & Yang, 2019; Guo et al., 2020). In vocational settings, this logic is especially valuable because professional competence is demonstrated through integrated performance rather than isolated recall.

Assessment, Feedback, and Collaboration

Authentic assessment asks students to apply knowledge in performances resembling meaningful real-world practices (Gulikers et al., 2004; Ashford-Rowe et al., 2014). Rubrics and explicit success criteria can strengthen transparency, self-regulation, and consistency across assessors (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Brookhart & Chen, 2015; Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). Feedback is most productive when it is timely, dialogic, and usable for subsequent improvement (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Henderson et al., 2019; Wisniewski et al., 2020). A webinar festival creates a setting in which multiple teachers and external experts can contribute complementary judgments, provided that common criteria and moderation procedures are established.

Webinars, Digital Participation, and Vocational Learning

Synchronous online environments can support interaction, explanation, questioning, and community when their pedagogical purpose is explicit (Hrastinski, 2008; Martin et al., 2017; Lowenthal et al., 2020). During and after the COVID-19 disruption, evidence also highlighted unequal access, digital competence, learner self-regulation, and teacher readiness as decisive conditions for online participation (Dhawan, 2020; Hodges et al., 2020; Trust & Whalen, 2020; UNESCO, 2020; OECD, 2020). Digital competence frameworks similarly emphasize communication, collaboration, content creation, safety, and problem solving (Redecker, 2017; Falloon, 2020). These dimensions map closely onto the demands of organizing and presenting a student webinar.

METHODS

The source manuscript is a descriptive conceptual-practice article rather than an experimental effectiveness study. Accordingly, this English version preserves that design and does not infer causal effects. The analysis synthesizes the proposed webinar-festival procedure, the roles of teachers and students, assessment principles, and implementation challenges described for vocational PjBL. The unit of analysis is the assessment model itself: a sequence in which students complete a project, prepare a webinar, publicly present the product, participate in discussion, and receive collaborative summative judgments and feedback from relevant subject teachers and, where appropriate, external experts.

The analysis was organized into four dimensions: (1) alignment with PjBL; (2) collaborative assessment architecture; (3) digital and communicative requirements; and (4) implementation constraints. This interpretive organization is consistent with qualitative descriptive work that seeks to provide a practice-near account of an educational innovation rather than estimate treatment effects (Sandelowski, 2000; Braun & Clarke, 2021).

Table 1. Project Implementation Stages, Core Activities, and Assessment Opportunities

Stage	Core activity	Assessment opportunity
Project planning	Teachers align productive and supporting subjects around one project.	Shared outcomes and criteria are agreed.
Production	Student teams investigate, design, create, and document the product.	Process evidence, teamwork, disciplinary competence.
Webinar preparation	Students prepare flyer, promotion, presentation, moderator, and technical roles.	Communication, digital literacy, organization.
Webinar festival	Teams present products and answer questions from the audience.	Authentic performance and cross-subject summative assessment.
Feedback and reporting	Teachers/experts provide feedback and consolidate scores.	Common rubric, moderation, reflection, reporting.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Webinar Festival as Collaborative Summative Assessment

The proposed model positions the webinar festival at the culmination of a PjBL cycle. Rather than asking students to submit unrelated final tasks in several subjects, teachers identify assessable dimensions within one shared project. Productive-subject teachers can judge technical quality; language teachers can assess oral and written communication; informatics teachers can assess digital presentation; mathematics and integrated science teachers can assess relevant quantitative or scientific reasoning; and entrepreneurship teachers can assess product positioning and promotion. This arrangement operationalizes constructive alignment and authentic assessment by linking learning activities, project evidence, and assessment criteria (Biggs & Tang, 2011; Gulikers et al., 2004).

Public presentation adds an important performance dimension. Students must explain what they produced, justify decisions, respond to questions, and communicate with an audience beyond their immediate classroom. Such audience-facing work can increase the authenticity of projects and create richer feedback loops (Larmer et al., 2015; Carless & Boud, 2018). The source article also proposes involving experts and parents. This is pedagogically plausible, but external feedback should complement rather than replace teacher judgment unless scoring standards, assessor training, and moderation are established.

Assessment Quality and Rubric Design

The main technical requirement is a shared analytic rubric. Without common descriptors, multiple assessors may generate inconsistent scores even when collaboration is strong. Rubrics should separate project-product quality, disciplinary knowledge, communication, collaboration, digital execution, and reflection, while avoiding double-counting the same evidence across subjects. Evidence on rubric use supports explicit criteria and rater calibration as mechanisms for improving transparency and judgment consistency (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Brookhart & Chen, 2015). Peer and self-assessment may also be incorporated formatively when students are trained to interpret criteria (Topping, 2009; Double et al., 2020).

Implementation Challenges

The source manuscript identifies stable internet access, data quota, technological literacy, learner independence, collaboration, and presenter readiness as principal challenges. These constraints are consistent with broader evidence showing that online learning quality depends on access, self-regulation, digital competence, interaction, and instructional design (Broadbent & Poon, 2015; Dhawan, 2020; Bond et al., 2021). A feasible implementation therefore requires a technical rehearsal, backup connectivity or recorded-presentation option, clear role allocation, accessible platforms, and contingency procedures for students with connectivity limitations.

Teacher collaboration is equally important. Cross-subject assessment requires agreement on the project brief, timeline, evidence to be collected, scoring responsibilities, and how marks are combined. Professional collaboration can improve coherence, but coordination costs should be acknowledged. Schools should begin with a limited number of subjects whose outcomes naturally intersect with the project and expand only after the workflow is stable (Vangrieken et al., 2015; Admiraal et al., 2021).

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

For implementation in vocational schools, the webinar festival should be treated as an assessment system rather than merely an online event. Before the project begins, participating teachers should map competencies, publish a common timeline, specify individual and group evidence, and agree on rubric dimensions. During the project, formative checkpoints should be used to identify technical and conceptual problems. At the festival, assessors should score only their assigned dimensions and record concise feedback. Afterward, scores should be moderated and students should receive a consolidated report that distinguishes technical competence, communication, collaboration, and project management.

LIMITATIONS

This article describes an innovation and its implementation logic; it does not report a controlled comparison, validated collaborative-assessment instrument, inter-rater reliability, or quantitative evidence that webinar festivals improve achievement. The claims should therefore be interpreted as a practice-informed framework requiring empirical validation. Future studies should examine learning outcomes, student workload, perceived fairness, rubric reliability, assessor agreement, digital-access equity, and the comparative efficiency of integrated versus separate subject assessments.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A webinar festival can serve as an innovative collaborative summative-assessment technique for vocational PjBL by bringing several subjects together around one authentic student project. The model allows project products to be publicly communicated and reviewed by teachers and invited experts while creating opportunities to assess disciplinary competence, communication, collaboration, and digital performance. Its viability depends on common assessment criteria, coordinated teacher roles, student preparation, reliable digital access, and procedures for fair scoring. Schools adopting the model should pilot a shared rubric, conduct assessor moderation, provide technical alternatives for connectivity problems, and evaluate student experience before scaling the approach.

REFERENCES

Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2021). Schools as professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional development of their teachers? Professional Development in Education, 47(4), 684–698.

Almulla, M. A. (2020). The effectiveness of the project-based learning approach as a way to engage students in learning. SAGE Open, 10(3), 1–15.

Ashford-Rowe, K., Herrington, J., & Brown, C. (2014). Establishing the critical elements that determine authentic assessment. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39(2), 205–222.

Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. The Clearing House, 83(2), 39–43.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for Quality Learning at University (4th ed.). Open University Press.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21, 5–31.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Soloway, E., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning. Educational Psychologist, 26(3–4), 369–398.

Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2021). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18, 50.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38(6), 698–712.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in reflexive thematic analysis? Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18(3), 328–352.

Broadbent, J., & Poon, W. L. (2015). Self-regulated learning strategies and academic achievement in online higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 27, 1–13.

Brookhart, S. M., & Chen, F. (2015). The quality and effectiveness of descriptive rubrics. Educational Review, 67(3), 343–368.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(8), 1315–1325.

Chen, C.-H., & Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Research Review, 26, 71–81.

Condliffe, B., Quint, J., Visher, M. G., Bangser, M. R., Drohojowska, S., Saco, L., & Nelson, E. (2017). Project-Based Learning: A Literature Review. MDRC.

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49(1), 5–22.

Double, K. S., McGrane, J. A., & Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2020). The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis. Educational Psychology Review, 32, 481–509.

Falloon, G. (2020). From digital literacy to digital competence. Educational Technology Research and Development, 68, 2449–2472.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment. The Internet and Higher Education, 2(2–3), 87–105.

Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. Educational Technology Research and Development, 52, 67–86.

Guo, P., Saab, N., Post, L. S., & Admiraal, W. (2020). A review of project-based learning in higher education. International Journal of Educational Research, 102, 101586.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112.

Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). The challenges of feedback in higher education. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44(8), 1237–1252.

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. EDUCAUSE Review, 27 March.

Hrastinski, S. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. EDUCAUSE Quarterly, 31(4), 51–55.

Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. Educational Research Review, 2(2), 130–144.

Kokotsaki, D., Menzies, V., & Wiggins, A. (2016). Project-based learning: A review of the literature. Improving Schools, 19(3), 267–277.

Krajcik, J. S., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (2006). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences. Cambridge University Press.

Larmer, J., Mergendoller, J. R., & Boss, S. (2015). Setting the Standard for Project Based Learning. ASCD.

Lowenthal, P. R., Borup, J., West, R. E., & Archambault, L. (2020). Thinking beyond Zoom: Using asynchronous video to maintain connection and engagement. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 28(2), 383–391.

Markula, A., & Aksela, M. (2022). The key characteristics of project-based learning. Education Sciences, 12(9), 596.

Martin, F., & Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in online learning. Online Learning, 22(1), 205–222.

Martin, F., Parker, M. A., & Deale, D. F. (2017). Examining interactivity in synchronous virtual classrooms. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 18(3), 227–261.

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning. Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199–218.

OECD. (2020). Education Responses to COVID-19: Embracing Digital Learning and Online Collaboration. OECD Publishing.

Panadero, E., Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. M. (2018). Fusing self-regulated learning and formative assessment. The Australian Educational Researcher, 45, 13–31.

Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited. Educational Research Review, 9, 129–144.

Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L., & Koole, M. (2020). Online university teaching during and after the COVID-19 crisis. Postdigital Science and Education, 2, 923–945.

Redecker, C. (2017). European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators: DigCompEdu. Publications Office of the European Union.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in Nursing & Health, 23(4), 334–340.

Thomas, J. W. (2000). A Review of Research on Project-Based Learning. Autodesk Foundation.

Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. Theory Into Practice, 48(1), 20–27.

Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 28(2), 189–199.

UNESCO. (2020). Education in a Post-COVID World: Nine Ideas for Public Action. UNESCO.

Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2015). Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. Educational Research Review, 15, 17–40.

Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? Studies in Educational Evaluation, 37(1), 3–14.

Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 3087.