

Student #13 vs #19

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 #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]

[STUDENT #19's ESSAY]

I belonged to the Monster Truck group for the SHIP course this semester. Monster Trucks refer to over-height or over-weight vehicles that cause a great deal of damage to infrastructures. Recent cases of problems due to Monster Trucks include how over-height vehicles crashing into bridges crossing overhead, or the constant load of over-weight vehicles causing cracks and failures on roads over time. The goal of our team was to develop a creative solution that will prevent these accidents from happening in the future.

In order to accomplish this goal, first, each team member did a background research on current countermeasures. From this research, we found different countermeasures in different countries, including the placement of height clearance barriers, vehicle weight measuring checkpoints, and height measuring checkpoints. However, accidents by oversized vehicles repeatedly happen, and they are still a critical issue to the safety of road. Considering this reality, our team critically re-evaluated the current countermeasures. This evaluation helped our team to find key points such as limitations of current countermeasures, and what can be improved.

Based on this knowledge that we gained, our team moved on to our key mission, which was to tackle the issue of Monster Trucks. Individual brainstorming and research about possible new solutions were done, and was presented to the whole team during sessions. In this process, our team succeeded in coming up with several ideas, including using drones to detect oversized vehicles, implanting sensors to existing measuring checkpoints, and making ID cards that detect which vehicle is violating the height limits. Ideas which were similar or used the same technology were combined.

Finally, our team decided on approaching the Monster Truck issue from 3 solutions; UAV recognition system, Transport ID, and the Smart Toll Gate. From this point, our group broke up into 3 pairs, each in role of one solution. Within the pairs, each solution was developed further. Pairs decided the design, evaluated the feasibility, checked the technology required for the solution they were in charge of. By this way, the solutions were specified. In the sessions on Friday, each pair gave presentations of their achievements of improving their solution and gave feedback to each other. In the last few sessions, presentations of each solution were combined and edited to construct the final presentation from the Monster Truck group as a whole.

Each member of the Monster Truck team played an important role and contributed to the team throughout the project. My greatest contributions were finding the technology of WIM, and developing the design of Smart Toll Gate.

In the process of background research about our project, each member was assigned a country to do research on. I was in role of searching countermeasures taken in the United States of America, due to my personal background living there as a child. In order to tackle the issue of Monster Trucks, USA was using height clearance barriers which were bar like structures that notified the height limit to the drivers. Moreover, certain routes were designated only for large sized vehicles to prevent large vehicles from causing issue on regular roads. Additionally, what was the most interesting was the system called WIM. WIM stands for Weigh-In-Motion, and this system weighs the vehicle as it passes over a section on the road with sensors implanted underneath. In one of the classes, I introduced these solutions to my team, as examples of ideas we could build up on for our own creative solution.

Next, in the process of developing our original creative solutions, my largest contribution to the team was insisting the usage of a new version of WIM. Here, there were still several concepts to consider,

such as the cost and feasibility. I contributed to the team by suggesting using a simple design to cut costs, or constructing WIM in key points like toll gates, where several oversized vehicles pass by. Due to the fact that another team member was thinking of a plan of measuring height with sensors at the toll gates, we decided to combine our ideas. This innovated version of a toll gate, which our group decided to name the Smart Toll Gate, aims to efficiently measure height and weight simultaneously. However, at this point, our idea was nothing more than a general imagination. Therefore, we spent much time discussing about the specific design, and researched what kind of technology will be required. I insisted to place the WIM before the toll gate and the height sensors inside the toll gate. Additionally, using the same sensors used in the toll gate, we decided to place them before structures including bridges or tunnels, to prevent oversized vehicles from entering areas where height is limited. Throughout the workshops in SHIP course, I acquired several skills and also gained knowledge from fields in Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering.

In the group discussions held each week, I improved my skill on discussing, thinking creatively, and presenting. In some of the earlier discussions, it was in fact somewhat difficult for me to discuss due to my lack of background knowledge in Monster Trucks, and uncomfortableness in group work. However, as the course moved on, my research ability improved, and I was able to get more involved in group discussions. I became more confident in discussing with my group, which lead to myself making better individual presentation. Additionally, with the help of my group members, I improved on thinking more creatively. Some ideas seemed impossible at first, but with thorough research and planning, we were able to develop it to the level of using the solution on site.

Moreover, from the weekly presentations from other groups, I learned several facts related to fields in Civil and Mechanical Engineering. I never knew the how surveys on radioactive power were imperative. Presentations from the Mechanical Engineering taught me that creativity in their field is the key to solving daily issues such as the gap between train and platform, making automatic doors, and so on. Groups working on stopping CO2 emission especially surprised me with the idea of using electric planes.

Overall, from SHIP, I was stimulated in several ways. Many of the international students amazed me and acted as role models in how to facilitate discussions, make questions, and present in a way that will improve each other. Interaction with different majors also let me learn topics I was unfamiliar before.

[END of STUDENT #19'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 essays from students #13 and #19 according to the specified rubric, we'll examine each essay based on the three main criteria: Project Description, Role and Contribution, and Reflection and Insight.

1. Project Description

- Student #13: The student provided a clear description of the project 'Science Communication on High-Level Radioactive Waste', detailing the objectives, methodology (use of questionnaires), and conclusion. The process, involving designing and analyzing questionnaires, was explained with clarity, indicating a strong understanding of the project's purpose and structure.
- Student #19: This student described the 'Monster Truck' project, outlining its goals, research methods, and the development of solutions like UAV recognition systems and Smart Toll Gates. The description is comprehensive, covering various aspects of the project from initial research to solution development.

Comparison: Both students effectively described their projects, demonstrating a good grasp of their respective topics. However, #13's focus on the impact of their project (identifying public misconceptions about radioactive waste) gives their essay a slight edge in terms of depth.

Score: #13: +1, #19: -1

2. Role and Contribution

- Student #13: The student detailed their involvement in questionnaire design, result analysis, and presentation aspects of the project. They also highlighted their collaborative work with Professor Wang and their role in handling the English version of the questionnaire.
- Student #19: This student's contribution was centered around the research of countermeasures in the USA, development of the Smart Toll Gate concept, and integration of WIM technology. Their active role in the project is evident, especially in terms of bringing innovative ideas and integrating them into the project.

Comparison: Both students played significant roles in their projects. #19 seems to have contributed more in terms of innovative ideas and technology integration, which is a critical aspect of the workshop's goal.

Score: #13: -1, #19: +1

3. Reflection and Insight

- Student #13: The reflection shows a clear understanding of the importance of teamwork and collaboration. The student acknowledges the sensitivity of their project topic and the need for careful question design, demonstrating self-awareness and adaptability.
- Student #19: This student's reflection is focused more on personal growth, especially in terms of improving research skills, creative thinking, and confidence in group discussions. There is also an acknowledgment of the learning gained from other disciplines, showing an open-minded approach.

Comparison: Both students showed good reflective learning, but #19's essay demonstrates a broader spectrum of personal growth, touching on various aspects such as confidence, creativity, and interdisciplinary learning.

Score: #13: -1, #19: +1

Overall Evaluation and Final Score:

- Student #13: Total Score = -1 (Project Description) + -1 (Role and Contribution) + -1 (Reflection and Insight) = -3
- Student #19: Total Score = +1 (Project Description) + +1 (Role and Contribution) + +1 (Reflection and Insight) = +3

Based on this evaluation, Student #19's essay is better overall. They demonstrated a stronger role in contributing innovative solutions to their project, showed a greater range of personal growth, and provided a detailed project description that was equally comprehensive as #13's.