

# #20 superior in all

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 #14's ESSAY]

The goal of this project is to design a questionnaire to understand the public's thoughts and concerns about the disposal of high-level radioactive waste, and one which can at the same time give the respondents some information and a general idea about the disposal of high-level radioactive waste. Then by gathering the results and by analyzing the results we aim to understand the public and at the same time assess the questions in the questionnaire to see if the questions are able to earn the

information or results that our group wants and to modify any questions. The importance to understand the public's thought and concerns about the disposal of high-level radioactive waste all lies in the point that the disposal of high-level radioactive waste is not carried out because of the lack of public approval. So, by understanding about the public, we could think of ways to earn the approval by the public.

Through the two months working in this project, we were able to design and analyze two questionnaires. One questionnaire was designed for the people in the SHIP class, there were 40 responses and through the analysis we concluded that the questionnaire had confusing wording and there was a need to modify the words. The other questionnaire was designed for the public, there were 133 responses and through the analysis we concluded that the public only has a little knowledge about high-level radioactive waste, does not know the details of the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and that most accept and think that the waste should be disposed in their own countries.

Throughout the project what we have done was to design questions. When doing so, we first thought of what specifically we had to know about the public, then after that we thought of the type of format that is suitable for what we want to know and after that we chose the appropriate choices for the question. Finally, we shape it up and make it into a question and modify the wording so it would fit the target respondent.

I thought that my role in this project was an idea giver, analyzer, and translator. I thought that I was an idea giver as I thought that I have contributed to the project by thinking of new ideas for the question of the questionnaire. For example, I have thought of the idea for the question number 11 which asked the closest radius that the respondents can accept the disposal site of high-level radioactive waste, this question intends to find an image of a specific distance that the public can accept, by knowing a distance that the public can accept it could be used for the consideration of the disposal site of high-level radioactive waste.

I thought that I was an analyzer as I had contributed in the analysis of the results. When talking about the analysis, I have contributed especially on the analysis to divide the respondents of the Japanese questionnaire into public and experts. When dividing the respondents we had to analyze many of the technical issue related questions and free answer questions, so as one of the native Japanese speakers I had to analyze the people's answers and see if there were any respondents that could be classified as "experts". For example, although we gave an overall classification by seeing whether the respondents answered that they have done any scientific research related to the disposal of high-level radioactive waste, some respondents who was not classified as experts was then classified as an expert as their response to the free answer question was an answer which a person with expert knowledge could only answer. I thought that I was a translator as I have contributed in the creation of the Japanese questionnaire. Like I have previously explained, as I was one of the native Japanese speakers in our group, after the English questionnaire was made, I have done the translation of the questionnaire into Japanese.

As our group's project was different to other groups, I thought that it was very hard but interesting to do the project. On the other hand, as our group's project was different to other groups, many of the things that we learnt in the SHIP lecture was hard to apply into the project. I thought so because our group's project aimed to design a questionnaire to understand the public, while for the other groups' project they aimed to find, or think of a solution to a problem that they found, which is very different and as the previous SHIP workshop and this SHIP workshop both focused on trying to find a problem and then think of a solution, it was hard to apply.

From the series of workshops, I thought that I have learnt the importance of sharing each person's idea no matter how small or boring it might look. Through out the SHIP workshops each group had to think, or find a problem and a solution to it and in this process all the members in the project had to think of some ideas, but when thinking of ideas there would always be some ideas that may seem very small or meaningless for the person and the person usually won't present that. On the other hand I learnt that it is important to present any small idea as these ideas could then be a trigger for other members or even yourself to think of new ideas.

[END of STUDENT #14'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 essays of students #14 and #20, we'll assess 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. Each criterion will be analyzed separately, followed by an overall comparison and scoring.

#### **Technical Knowledge and Application**

Understanding of Concepts:

- #14: Demonstrates a good understanding of the issue surrounding high-level radioactive waste disposal and public perception. The use of questionnaires to gauge public opinion shows a grasp of the social aspects of technological solutions.
- #20: Shows an understanding of the impact of oversized vehicles on infrastructure.

The student's research into existing solutions indicates a solid grasp of the technical challenges involved.

**Practical Application:**

- #14: Effectively applied their knowledge in designing and analyzing questionnaires. However, the practical application seems limited to survey design rather than direct technological solutions.
- #20: Applied their understanding to develop a specific solution, the Transport ID, which is a practical and potentially implementable solution.

**Innovation and Problem Solving:**

- #14: The approach of using questionnaires for understanding public perception is not highly innovative in the context of technical problem-solving.
- #20: Shows more innovation by creating a new solution (Transport ID) with added features like data encryption.

Score: #20 (+1), #14 (-1)

### **Teamwork and Collaborative Skills**

**Individual Role and Contribution:**

- #14: Clearly defines their roles as an idea giver, analyzer, and translator, with specific examples.
- #20: Also clearly defines their role in developing Transport ID and contributing to group discussions.

**Team Interaction and Communication:**

- #14: Limited details on interaction with the team, focusing more on individual contributions.
- #20: Mentions asking questions and providing feedback within the group, indicating more active team interaction.

**Peer Engagement:**

- #14: No specific mention of engaging with peers or supporting team members.
- #20: Discusses engaging with other groups and team members through questions and comments, indicating better peer engagement.

Score: #20 (+1), #14 (-1)

### **Reflective Learning and Personal Growth**

**Self-Reflection and Insights:**

- #14: Reflects on the importance of sharing ideas and acknowledges the uniqueness of their project.
- #20: Demonstrates reflection on the importance of asking questions and the value of feedback, showing a deeper level of insight.

**Design Thinking and Process:**

- #14: Limited detail on the application of design thinking methods.
- #20: Shows a clear process of ideation, combining existing solutions with new ideas.

**Skill and Attitude Development:**

- #14: Reflects on the learning process but with less focus on skill development.
- #20: Indicates development in critical thinking and adaptability through frequent meetings and collaboration.

Score: #20 (+1), #14 (-1)

## **Overall Comparison and Scoring**

**Technical Knowledge and Application:** #20 demonstrates a stronger application of technical knowledge and innovation, particularly in developing a tangible solution.

**Teamwork and Collaborative Skills:** #20 shows more active engagement and contribution within the team, with clear examples of interaction and peer engagement.

**Reflective Learning and Personal Growth:** #20 exhibits deeper self-reflection and a more structured thought process in project management and personal skill development.

Final Score: #20 (+3), #14 (-3)

Based on the analysis, Student #20's essay is superior overall, demonstrating a stronger performance in all three criteria of the rubric.