

Student Essays Compared and Evaluated

December 5, 2023

The workshop course is provided by technology-oriented engineering department. The goal is to understand technologies but also to foster motivation and active involvement of groupwork. The assignment given to the students was as follows:

1. Kinematic Synthesis of Mechanisms <Train Gap Filler>

The gap between the train and the platform at train stations is a significant safety hazard, often leading to accidents. This risk is especially high for children, the elderly, and individuals with physical disabilities with wheelchairs. The challenge is to devise a mechanism that effectively mitigates this danger.

2. Net Zero X <All Electric Airplane>

The objective of this project is to develop a strategy for reducing CO₂ emissions from airplanes. It involves researching the current challenges faced by the airline industry regarding CO₂ emissions and conceptualizing an all-electric airplane as a viable solution to significantly lower these emissions.

3. Radioactive <Science Communication on High-Level Radioactive Waste>

High-level radioactive waste (HLW) is created by the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. Storage cannot provide the permanent isolation of the wastes from human's environment. This workshop aims to reveal the current conditions and possible disposal methods of HLW, and understand ways of dealing with real social issues.

4. Monster Track <Damages on Infrastructures by Oversized Vehicles>

The oversized loading induced an excessive external load which exceeds load-carrying capacity of bridges, resulted in collapse incidents. Clarify the common challenges in protection of infrastructures during their life cycle from oversized vehicles and come up with initiatives and solutions to this issue.

Around six students formed groups and challenged one of the above problems in seven 3-hour workshops: ideation, interim report, prototyping, final report, and a reflection essay at the end. Each student is requested to create an individual reflection essay including the following descriptions.

- Project description (300-400 words)

Title, goal and conclusion of the project

Process of the project: how you applied design thinking methods

- Contribution (300-400 words)

Your role in the project

Your contribution to the project

- Reflection (200-300 words)

Write freely but we are interested in what you learned from the series of workshops not only professional knowledge and skills but also how to contribute to and facilitate the workshops

The following two essays were prepared by students according to the above instructions.

[STUDENT #1's ESSAY]

Our presentation title is "Train Gap Filler", which statedly reveals our goal of designing new mechanisms. In our project, we first explained the significance of train gap: there is the possibility for the train to hit into the station. However, the gap still causes to some safety and efficiency issues. Therefore, we came up with two designs to fill the train gap and solve this problem; they apply different mechanisms. One used pivot, sliding, gear, and piston (giving three pivots, and would lay

down the platform); this one is comparatively more cost friendly and simpler. The other is formed with pneumatic cylinder (raising the platform) which is more expensive and complicated, yet more reliable and owns higher degrees of freedom. They both have pros and cons, but still aim for the same goal.

I also created four designs by myself, although it is not used in this presentation. Three of them are pretty similar (I actually developed two others based on my first design), which are composed of gears and rack rods. The other one applies fluid (hydraulic) pressure. In my first design, the rack rod is stucked on the door that, when door opens, will drive location fixed gear, location-fixed gear, and rack rod, making the rack rod extending out, so the platform stucked on it will show up and fill the train gap. This is similar to my second design: But the platforms move from vertical to horizontal instead of just move in and out horizontally, so it is no needed to create another space under the door to place the platform when it is kept in (this one just stand close to the wall /door). And my third design, also similar to the last two: But in this design, I added the mechanism of “tension and pulling”, so the platform is laid down and closed up by the wire. And my fourth design is much more different from the last three (I only drew the righthand-side half): You can think the two cylinders are connected syringes, so when one side is pushed in (e.g. door side), the other side (e.g. platform side) will be pushed out. Although my designs are not chosen to be presented, I still contributed some ideas and make innovations by myself which I found very reassured and interested.

For this project, I was firstly suggested the application of hydraulic pressure to drive the whole system. I think that kind of gave Takato some ideas of making his design (Design 2). As the result, I asked him if he needs any help with the final presentation, since I can thoroughly understand his design, but he himself is strong and smart to handle it. Anyways, I worked on my part only, which is the summary. I feel sad that I did not have enough time to summarize the whole project and our achievements during the presentation time, having most of my part being omitted. So I want to put it here. Overall, I looked back on all we have done during this quarter. In the very beginning, we learned the basics of Fusion 360, the software to draw designs, so we are able to create 2D sketches (side-view) and extend it into 3D models. Furthermore, I make our model to be movable. We took our first Fusion Homework and created a pivot (cylinder) overgoes the model, so the model can rotate on it. Although we were trying to make a motor, so it can rotate automatically, but due to the time limitation, we did not do that. And then, we discussed about the mechanisms used in our daily life, we each suggested one to two example(s), for instance bicycle, mechanical pen, wireless charging, and for me, I picked the key and mop. And finally, we voted for the “train gap” to be the topic of this final presentation. We aim to cover up the gap between the train and station to prevent people from being tripped on it or drop anything into the gap, and thus interrupt the whole process of train and people’s movement. After we decided our topic, we each created one to two designs, but we only chose two from all and extended on them (I originally want to show everyone’s works but some members lost their designs, so I did not do so). And in all, we want to minimize the cost and gap distance, and simplify the mechanism for our design to achieve the ideal state. Although we have not had the chance to discussed on it in deep.

In my perspective, I think this class have taught me a lot, including the aforementioned mechanisms, physics, and software application knowledge and also collaboration skills. Since we are in groups and required to work and present together, it is significant to have high efficiency of communication about everything, like choosing topics, deciding work distribution, exchanging and discussing ideas. At the beginning, we did not know each other well and felt awkward talking to each other, so most of the time we were in silence, needing the TA to guide the process. But now, we can discuss very smoothly, and the TA only need to assist us and answer some of our questions instead of talking all the time. Furthermore, we are not only discussing with our groupmates but also people from other groups. From these experiences, I also learned to talk to people I am unfamiliar with without awkwardness or shyness; this also gives improvement when I am doing presentation. In addition, I think the work of asking question, giving feedback, or summarizing the class has helped me a lot. Initially, to be honest,

I hate this work since I really feel uncomfortable talking in front of many people. Yet after several times of practice, I think I have more courage and can feel more relaxed doing so. On the other hand, giving feedback trains me to think critically by myself but not just listen to what others say. It also makes me develop my expression, so I can quickly, effectively, and precisely convey my idea to the presenter(s). So overall, I appreciate to have this class that teaches me the presenting, thinking, and collaborating skills.

[END of STUDENT #1's ESSAY]

[STUDENT #13's ESSAY]

As a group, we constructed a project named science communication on high-level radioactive waste, based on the reason that there may exist some misconceptions or knowledge gap between the general public and the organizations dealing with nuclear activities. The main objective of our project is to find out the public's concerns and understanding of high-level radioactive waste. Since our topic is about communicating on the high-level radioactive waste, we decided to have a questionnaire as a way of communication. Our project includes two questionnaires and results analysis on the responses from the questionnaires trying to identify the major considerations of the general public towards the management and disposal of high-level radioactive waste.

After receiving a general image of what is high-level radioactive waste from our facilitator professor, the students discussed on what kind of questions will be sent to the public and designed suitable questions that involve critical thinking for the respondents. The first questionnaire was a trial targeted mainly to the students and facilitator from the SHIP course, whereas the second questionnaire will be sent to a wider range of audience. Since the topic of radioactive is quite sensitive, we spent time considering the information provided in each question and ensure all the answer choices are appropriate for every possible participant of our questionnaire. After receiving enough responses from the first questionnaire, we started analyzing the choices made by the respondents to find out why he/she has chosen that particular option.

Based on the reflections from the first questionnaire and midterm presentation, we constructed the second questionnaire with improvements. We kept a few questions from the first questionnaire which had given us positive feedback and edited/removed those which was not very helpful. Furthermore, we added questions with the explicit implication of identifying the public's general understanding and concerns based on two major investigations, 1) public and political considerations, and 2) scientific-technical issues, which could better fit our objective of this project. Similar to the first result analysis, we group up each choice made by the respondents in the second questionnaire and provide explanations for each group. From the analysis, we concluded that more than 60% of the respondents have limited understanding of high-level radioactive waste, the organizations of nuclear energy should provide information with educating purpose to the general public to fill up the knowledge gap and avoid misconceptions in dealing with high-level radioactive waste.

Since our project involves question designing and result analysis, my main role was just like other group members, which was to brainstorm ideas on the type of questions to be given to the public in order to obtain the necessary information to support the objective of our project. Before the second questionnaire was sent out, I and 2 other group members worked together with our professor in finalizing the questions for English version. After getting the results from the questionnaire, the whole group worked together in identifying the possible trend of choices from the result of the two questionnaires and I took the role in analyzing the results from the English version of the second questionnaire while those who are bilingual focused on both the Japanese and English version.

For the midterm presentation, I was assigned to present the material section, which I needed to explain the results we obtained for the questions relating to the type of material that is the most suitable for the storing of high-level radioactive waste. Not surprisingly, all the questions from the other groups were material-related, which means the section about the material is the most intriguing topic and caught the most attention. The same happens to the final presentation where more questions were asked on the material section of the presentation. For the final presentation, I volunteered to present the introduction and objective of our project, and it was much harder than I thought. Since each group was given 10 minutes to present, I have only roughly 2 minutes to explain the background of

high-level radioactive waste and the objective of the project, while the same section took a total of 4 minutes in the midterm presentation.

Although this was the first time I worked with my classmates from the same major as a group, I tried my best to remove any barriers between each of us. Despite the amount of time spent together during the classes was not plenty enough, I always try to give my opinion and thoughts both during the meeting each week and outside in the line group we made. Furthermore, I participated in answering questions from other groups without being shy or having concerns because I know my group members will support and add-on to what I said if some information is missing.

I believe one of the most important aspects of the series of workshops is about teamwork and collaboration, which is also the reason why the students are in groups of 5 or 6 and not in individuals or groups of 2 only. What I learned from the workshops is not only about the knowledge of high-level radioactive waste, but moreover, I learned how to support my group members and work together with them at the same pace. The question designing part of the project required brainstorming and considerations in all forms (political, emotional, etc.) due to the sensitivity of the topic, and this is when collaborations between the group members, TA, and facilitator become extremely critical. Each of us gives our personal opinion and comes together to decide on the final layout of the questions, during this stage, we learned how to design questions with reference to an explicit objective while taking the sensitive information into consideration.

One possible improvement for our project can be using another type of communication. Due to time constraints, we were not able to contrast an interview to some of the respondents of the questionnaire, by having an interview can also be helpful in understanding the public's concerns and level of knowledge on the high-level radioactive waste. In my opinion, we can have the second questionnaire as an interview while the first questionnaire could be sent to a wider range of public.

[END of STUDENT #13's ESSAY]

Compare and evaluate the above two essays according to the rubric specified below.

[SCORING RUBRIC]

Comprehensive Evaluation of Workshop Course

1. Technical Knowledge and Application (1/3)

- Understanding of Concepts: Evaluates how well the student grasps the technological and theoretical concepts relevant to the project.
- Practical Application: Assesses the effectiveness of applying technical knowledge in practical situations, specifically in project design and development.
- Innovation and Problem Solving: Measures the creativity and innovation in addressing project challenges and proposing effective solutions.

2. Teamwork and Collaborative Skills (1/3)

- Individual Role and Contribution: Looks at how clearly the student defines and fulfills their role within the team, and their contribution to the project.
- Team Interaction and Communication: Evaluates the student's ability to communicate and collaborate effectively within the team.
- Peer Engagement: Considers the student's participation in peer learning, support to team members, and contribution to the team's dynamics.

3. Reflective Learning and Personal Growth (1/3)

- Self-Reflection and Insights: Assesses the depth of the student's self-reflection on personal learning and development throughout the project.
- Design Thinking and Process: Measures how well the student demonstrates the application of design thinking methods and management of the project process.
- Skill and Attitude Development: Evaluates the growth in the student's professional and soft skills, like critical thinking, adaptability, and communication.

[END of SCORING RUBRIC]

Compare and evaluate two essays based on the three main criteria in the above rubric: Project Description, Role and Contribution, and Reflection and Insight. Summarize the comparison of the three main criteria and then determine which essay is better overall.

The final score should be as follows. If one is superior to the other even slightly, award +1 point to the superior essay, and -1 point to the other. If one is clearly superior to the other, award +2 points to the clearly superior essay, and -2 point to the other. If both are the same, give each a score of 0.

To evaluate the essays by students #1 and #13, we will compare them based on the three main criteria of the scoring rubric: Technical Knowledge and Application, Teamwork and Collaborative Skills, and Reflective Learning and Personal Growth.

1. Technical Knowledge and Application

Student #1:

- Understanding of Concepts: #1 demonstrates a good understanding of mechanical concepts, particularly in the design of mechanisms to fill train gaps. They explain different designs with specifics like pivot, sliding, gear, piston, and hydraulic pressure.
- Practical Application: They applied their knowledge to create four original designs, though these weren't used in the final presentation.
- Innovation and Problem Solving: #1 shows creativity in devising multiple designs and adapting them based on the challenge's requirements.

Student #13:

- Understanding of Concepts: #13's project is more about communication and public understanding of high-level radioactive waste, rather than technical or mechanical design.
- Practical Application: Their application of knowledge is more towards designing questionnaires and analyzing results, which is less technically oriented compared to #1.
- Innovation and Problem Solving: There's innovation in how they approached the public's perception of high-level radioactive waste but less technical problem-solving.

Comparison: #1's essay displays more depth in technical knowledge and its application, as well as in innovation in solving a mechanical problem. #13's focus is more on communication and analysis, which, while important, is less technical in nature.

Score:

- Student #1: +1
- Student #13: -1

2. Teamwork and Collaborative Skills

Student #1:

- Individual Role and Contribution: #1 had a clear role in designing mechanisms and contributing ideas, though their individual designs were not used in the final presentation.
- Team Interaction and Communication: Interaction with the team seems limited; #1 mentions working mostly independently.
- Peer Engagement: #1 does not extensively mention engaging with peers beyond their individual contribution.

Student #13:

- Individual Role and Contribution: #13 was actively involved in designing questionnaires and analyzing results, showing a clear contribution.
- Team Interaction and Communication: They collaborated closely with the team, including brainstorming sessions and working with the professor.
- Peer Engagement: #13 engaged in presentations and discussions, contributing to and supporting the team.

Comparison: #13 shows more effective teamwork and collaborative skills, with active participation and engagement in team activities, compared to #1's more individual-focused approach.

Score:

- Student #1: -1
- Student #13: +1

3. Reflective Learning and Personal Growth

Student #1:

- Self-Reflection and Insights: #1 reflects on their learning, focusing on both technical and soft skills like communication and presentation.
- Design Thinking and Process: There's a clear demonstration of design thinking in their approach to creating multiple designs.
- Skill and Attitude Development: Shows development in presentation skills and critical thinking.

Student #13:

- Self-Reflection and Insights: #13 reflects on the importance of teamwork and understanding public perception, showing awareness of their learning process.
- Design Thinking and Process: #13's approach is less about design and more about research and communication.
- Skill and Attitude Development: They show growth in collaboration, communication, and understanding of sensitive topics.

Comparison: Both students display good reflective learning and personal growth, though in different areas. #1 focuses more on technical skills and design thinking, while #13 emphasizes teamwork and communication.

Score:

- Student #1: 0
- Student #13: 0

Overall Evaluation

When tallying the scores, Student #1 excels in Technical Knowledge and Application, while Student #13 shows stronger Teamwork and Collaborative Skills. In Reflective Learning and Personal Growth, they are on par with each other. Therefore, considering the rubric's equal weighting of these categories, Student #13's essay is slightly better overall due to their stronger emphasis on teamwork and collaboration, crucial elements in a group-oriented workshop course.

Final Score:

- Student #1: -1
- Student #13: +1