

#13 Better Overall Essay

December 9, 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 #11's ESSAY]

Out of all topics related to Net Zero, our team decided to focus on transportation aspects. In specific, we picked an electric airplane. Our project was named, "All-electric airplane - CO2 reduction". First, we redefined what is net-zero and what is an electric airplane. Our goal is to construct an airplane that runs with electricity and emits net-zero CO2. We calculated how much emissions will be reduced by replacing a current jet-fuel plane with an electric airplane and considered what we need to do to reach net zero by utilizing it. Next, from the many problems and potentials of an electric airplane we detected, we chose some of the major ones and introduced them. For example, we found the airline industry's contribution to the emission issues. It provide#13% of global emissions, and that is 1.04 billion tons per year. However, if we succeed in constructing FEA (full electric airplane), 87% of CO2 will be reduced. We can state that this electric airplane has great potential to contribute to reducing emissions. Based on this information, we divided our challenges into 3 parts, which are science, charging, and cost. With the science aspects, we tested multiple batteries to idealize the best suitable

battery type. Currently, Lithium-ion battery shares a large part of electronic devices, such as a smartphone. However, all-solid-state battery might be more suitable for electric airplane because it provides high specific energy, more safety, and less weight. Next, with the charging aspect, we simulated building a new electric power plant. Also, we examined the multiple methods to recharge electricity during flight. Lastly, we researched costs we need to commercialize electric airplanes. Since part of fuel price and maintenance cost will be cut, we can assume that we have at least 50% low-priced ticket. In conclusion, as we simulated with an airplane with 180 passengers for an 800km flight, an all-solid-state battery is the most appropriate battery. It leads to reduce about 87% of CO₂. This can also lower ticket prices by about 50-80%. Although the technology is not ready to commercialize planes yet, we believe more investigation will make it possible.

In this project, I mainly focused on the charging perspective, especially recharging during flights. Even if we use the most efficient battery, FEA still raises the cost and takes more time to charge compared to the current jet-fuel airplane. First, I focused on the regenerative brake. It is a technology that an airplane uses electricity for acceleration and propulsion, and charge electricity when it decelerates and level down. There is an airplane from JAXA, which succeeded with using regenerative soaring during a flight. I introduced a graph that shows the motor shaft output, which is basically how much energy it uses, and the remaining battery of the airplane. From the graph, we can observe that there is a moment that motor shaft output gets negative values. At the same time, the amount of remaining battery keeps constant or even increases. From this data, we can conclude that this airplane succeeded with regenerative soaring and recharging electricity. The minimum power we require for an airplane with 180 passengers' airplanes is calculated as about 6 MW. This is the potential energy we can convert to electricity. Although the specific values of efficiency to convert energy into electricity are not determined yet, I consider this technology will help to reduce the initial electricity we need. Next, I decided to work on solar power generation. This is the same technology we conduct on the ground, but for this situation, it is on the wing. I calculated the energy airplanes we can get from solar power with the equation $E = TSI * A * E * \text{flight time}$, where TSI is the total solar irradiance, A is the surface area wing, and E is the solar photovoltaic efficiency. As I calculated the percent of energy from solar power against total flight energy is about 0.07 to 0.7%. Although this does not contribute much to reduce the initial energy we need, I consider investigation on this field is still ongoing, so these values will be improved in the future.

From the lectures of this course, I learned a variety of methods evaluating the challenges we face. In the class time, we mainly use them to share the contents of research we did outside class. Also, we use it to divide work and research about the specific area each of us focused on. Overall, one of the most important things I learned through this course is to determine specific common goals initially, so that we can try to reach them with different perspectives. We considered having different perspective and works on individual tasks are important and useful methods. However, sometimes we lost the most important goals and concentrated into individual works too deeply. Therefore, we sometimes did calculations with different conditions. For example, I calculated the possible energy we can get with solar power generation during flight from papers I found. I tested with multiple situations, such as flight from Tokyo to San Francisco, Tokyo to Beijing, and Tokyo to Seoul. I was not aware that our goal is to create an airplane with 180 passengers with an 800km flight. Our group members discussed and decided within the class time, but I was too into my work and unaware about it. From this experience, I learned that it is important to share the information more often and check what is the final goal so that we do not lose.

[END of STUDENT #11'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 compare and evaluate the two student essays, we'll assess them based on the three main criteria from the rubric: Technical Knowledge and Application, Teamwork and Collaborative Skills, and Reflective Learning and Personal Growth.

1. Technical Knowledge and Application

Student #11 (Net Zero X Project)

- Understanding of Concepts: #11 demonstrates a strong understanding of the technological and theoretical concepts, such as CO2 emissions, electric airplanes, and various types of batteries. The detailed exploration of batteries and charging methods shows deep technical insight.
- Practical Application: The essay details practical applications like regenerative braking and solar power generation, indicating effective application of technical knowledge.
- Innovation and Problem Solving: Innovative solutions are proposed, like regenerative soaring and the use of all-solid-state batteries, showcasing creativity in problem-solving.

Student #13 (Radioactive Project)

- Understanding of Concepts: #13 shows a good understanding of the concept of high-level radioactive waste and the importance of public communication about it.
- Practical Application: The practical application is evident in the design and analysis of questionnaires to gauge public understanding and concerns.
- Innovation and Problem Solving: While the approach is methodical, it lacks the innovative problem-solving elements seen in #11's essay.

Evaluation: #11's essay demonstrates greater depth in technical knowledge and innovation. Therefore, #11: +1, #13: -1

2. Teamwork and Collaborative Skills

Student #11

- Individual Role and Contribution: Clearly defined role focusing on the charging aspect, with specific contributions to the project.
- Team Interaction and Communication: The essay indicates effective communication within the team, though details on team dynamics are not as pronounced.
- Peer Engagement: The essay implies engagement but does not detail interactions with peers beyond the project scope.

Student #13

- Individual Role and Contribution: #13 describes a collaborative role in questionnaire design and analysis, with specific tasks highlighted.
- Team Interaction and Communication: The essay emphasizes teamwork in designing questionnaires and analyzing results, showing strong team interaction.
- Peer Engagement: Demonstrates peer engagement through active participation in meetings and responding to other groups' queries.

Evaluation: #13's essay shows more emphasis on teamwork and collaboration. Therefore, #11: -1, #13: +1

3. Reflective Learning and Personal Growth

Student #11

- Self-Reflection and Insights: Reflects on the learning process, acknowledging the importance of maintaining focus on common goals.
- Design Thinking and Process: Describes the process of addressing the project, highlighting the use of design thinking.
- Skill and Attitude Development: Indicates growth in specific areas like evaluating challenges and maintaining project focus.

Student #13

- Self-Reflection and Insights: Provides deep insights into personal growth, teamwork, and the importance of collaboration.
- Design Thinking and Process: The process of questionnaire design and analysis reflects an application of design thinking.
- Skill and Attitude Development: Shows personal growth in teamwork, communication, and adapting to sensitive topics.

Evaluation: #13's essay reflects more on personal growth and the learning process. Therefore, #11: -1, #13: +1

Overall Evaluation and Scoring

Based on the above evaluation:

- Technical Knowledge and Application: #11: +1, #13: -1
- Teamwork and Collaborative Skills: #11: -1, #13: +1
- Reflective Learning and Personal Growth: #11: -1, #13: +1
-

Final Score: #11: -1, #13: +1

Conclusion: While Student #11's essay excels in the technical aspect, Student #13's essay is stronger in teamwork and reflective learning. Overall, considering the comprehensive evaluation, Student #13's essay is slightly superior.