

#20's Essay Superior

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 #20's ESSAY]

I was in the Monster group for this course, SHIP Research Planning and Skill A. Monster truck refer to oversized vehicles that have excessive weight and height. Our group focused on how these vehicles damage the infrastructure. I learned that over-weight vehicles can affect both bridges and roads. For instance, cracks at the structure of the bottom part of the bridge can be caused when an overweight vehicle repeatedly drives over. After studying the accidents caused by the Monster trucks and the current countermeasures for them, we decided that our goal was to generate solutions that would help maintain safe and secure infrastructure while having these types of vehicles.

I started thinking about my solutions by researching current solutions that are available. When researching I did not specify a region or a country as I wanted to collect different kinds of solutions. Also, because different regions will have varying environments with different traffic standards, I assumed that I could encounter solutions that I would not usually see or come up with. One of the existing solutions that I found interesting was the idea of using a monitoring device only for oversized trucks. The reason I focused on this solution is that it seemed to work in almost any road environment. Studying existing solutions is effective as it allows the solution to be more feasible. The fact that it is already being used in real life indicates that this solution is more doable than those that are not.

After choosing an existing solution I combined the solution with my ideas. This was how I invented my solution, Transport ID. It was necessary to generate new ideas so that it is an improved version of the solution. The improved idea would have new features that would solve the problems of the current solution. For instance, I added a data encryption feature to the Transport ID. I thought that this feature is necessary to prevent other parties such as the drivers from falsely inputting the data and cheat their way into unpermitted roads.

The Monster Truck group was divided into three subgroups each in charge of one solution so that we would have three solutions in total. I was in the Transport ID group as I was very involved in generating the solution. Hence, one of my roles in the Monster Truck group was to develop Transport ID as one of the solutions for our goal to maintain a safe and secure infrastructure. As the inventor of the Transport ID, I came up with its design. When creating the design diagram for the Transport ID I made sure that it was easy to understand. I avoided adding too many details to avoid confusion but enough information to show what the ID could do. In addition, I generated features that would solve the problem of current solutions, and finally, I considered and proposed the feasibility of this invention.

I also contributed to the group by asking questions to other group members. By asking questions and commenting on some of the details, I feel that they were able to reflect on their solution that they generated. I was able to go through the same process. When I was asked questions, I would add more details to the presentation so that it was more easily understood. In addition, I would also speak to the other groups about our group. I would often briefly talk about the solutions that we generated and the improvements we realized that we need to make the solutions more effective and feasible. This allowed me to summarize the things we have done that day so that we can acknowledge the progress of our project.

One of the important things I learned while participating in this workshop is the importance of asking questions to my group members and to other groups in the workshop. When I was asked a question by other people I noticed some aspects that need to be improved which I would have not noticed if they

did not ask about it. When they pointed out these aspects, I was able to make improvements on it so that my solution became more efficient and feasible. Not only the questions but I learned that comments from other people during a workshop are helpful. The comments were often new ideas that could be added to the solutions I generated. More comments meant that more features were added to the inventions and they would solve more issues related to the pre-existing solutions.

Another procedure I realized was important was frequently having short meetings while working on the presentation. Often times, I would have a meeting with the group members in the very beginning to divide the work. After working on the presentation, we would have our second and final meeting to make sure that all parts of the project are complete. Nonetheless, I noticed that having frequent meetings, more than twice is more helpful. During this project, I received more comments that significantly made my solution more effective and feasible due to the more frequent meetings we had.

[END of STUDENT #20'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 two student essays (Student #13 and Student #20) based on the specified rubric, I will break down the comparison into the three main criteria: Project Description, Role and Contribution,

and Reflection and Insight.

1. Project Description

Student #13:

- Describes the project on high-level radioactive waste clearly, outlining the objectives and methods (questionnaires).
- Demonstrates understanding of project's societal impact.
- Detailed account of project progression and adjustments made over time.

Student #20:

- Clearly explains the project on infrastructure damage by oversized vehicles.
- Reflects understanding of the real-world implications of the project.
- Describes the ideation process and the development of a specific solution (Transport ID).

Comparison:

Both essays are strong in their project descriptions, showing clarity and depth. #13 gives a slightly more detailed account of project adjustments, but #20 demonstrates more innovation in solution development.

Score: #13: 0, #20: +1

2. Role and Contribution

Student #13:

- Explains their role in question design and result analysis.
- Details involvement in questionnaire finalization and presentation preparation.
- Demonstrates collaborative work in the team.

Student #20:

- Describes their role in inventing and developing the 'Transport ID'.
- Details their contribution to design and feature enhancement.
- Reflects on their role in asking questions and aiding group reflection.

Comparison:

Both students illustrate their contributions and roles effectively. #13 shows consistent participation in various aspects, while #20 demonstrates a more focused and innovative contribution.

Score: #13: 0, #20: +1

3. Reflection and Insight

Student #13:

- Reflects on teamwork and the importance of collaboration.
- Demonstrates learning in designing sensitive questions and managing project objectives.
- Suggests improvements and acknowledges limitations.

Student #20:

- Shares insights on the importance of questioning and receiving feedback.
- Reflects on the learning process, emphasizing continuous improvement and the value of frequent meetings.
- Demonstrates understanding of the importance of feedback in refining solutions.

Comparison:

Both essays show deep reflection and personal growth. #13 focuses more on teamwork, while #20 highlights personal learning and adaptability. The depth of insight is comparable in both.

Score: #13: 0, #20: 0

Overall Evaluation

Based on the scoring rubric and the individual assessments:

- Student #13: Total Score = 0
- Student #20: Total Score = +2

Conclusion: Student #20's essay is better overall, demonstrating a slightly superior understanding and application of the project, a clearer definition of their individual role and contribution, and an equally reflective and insightful perspective on personal learning and growth.