

#14's Essay Slightly Superior

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 #2's ESSAY]

After much discussion we had decided to improve and add on a platform of some sort, more specifically to cover the gap that is found between the train itself and the train platform. If we were to cover the gap, we will reduce the risk of accidents regarding the gap such as belongings falling down as well as your foot getting stuck or someone falling onto the platform due to the gap. Our goal is to create a gap that will make it more convenient and safer for people, more specifically, disabled

people, to get on and off the trains. Working as a team, we had come up with two different solutions (Gap Closer 3000 and Mechanism 2) to potentially cover the gap and essentially create a gap filler of some sort.

Once we had decided to do train gaps, we had used the WWWWH (Who, What, Where, When, How) template and filled in all the necessarily details we needed to ensure that we had covered everything that we needed to in the presentation. Besides that, we also considered the pros and cons for each design and evaluated where exactly the mechanism was going to be inputted in, which had been decided to be onto the platform instead of the train due to the fact that it would essentially be easier to input on and would not require to break apart the train to input onto it which would take more time than placing on onto the platform.

Going through the two mechanisms, the Gap Closer 3000 uses pivot and sliding, as well as a gear and piston to function. Mechanism 2 on the other mostly uses a pneumatic cylinder which allows the platform to rotate more freely.

The Gap Filler 3000 is a lot less complicated than Mechanism 2 mainly because Mechanism 2 uses pneumatics and that is a higher degree of complexity. Mechanism 2 is also more costly when compared to Gap Closer 3000 due to its higher degree of complexity and use of pneumatics. Mechanism 2 however is more reliable and won't break as easily, it also has a higher degree of freedom.

As for my role and contribution, I focused more on finding out background information that one may need to know before continuing on to discuss our solutions. The background information that I found would be most useful for this presentation was 'What we had meant by train gap', 'Why exactly was the gap there in the first place' and 'Why had we decided to improve on it in the first place.'

Explaining briefly, the train gap is there due to the fact that trains aren't flexible as a whole which would mean that each train carriage would have to essentially turn and bend which needs space to avoid colliding with the platform. We had decided to improve on this mainly due to safety, many people get their foot stuck or lose their belongings due to the gap. Besides safety, there is also efficiency, we want to make it easier for people, regardless of their mobility, to get in and out on trains. But this would be more beneficial to disabled people as well.

Other contributions would include coming up with the pros and cons as well as filling up the template that was mentioned earlier. Prior to this, there was multiple designs that we had come up with, each of us had to design our own mechanism before voting on which one would deem more successful and more useful in stations. My design had not made it due to the fact that more space would be required to fully function the mechanism which would end up to be more costly and a larger waste of space.

Throughout the workshop, I had learned how to make and captivate the audience with a presentation as well as the basics of CAD that I am eager to implement onto and create better and new designs on new mechanisms in the future. Along with that, I also learned that communication in a presentation, both video and voice improve on a presentation by a lot. When one has good communication, the audience would be more willing or eager to listen and engage with the presenters instead of turning off video and just using voice, it is more impactful when communication is used effectively.

Overall, I had a great time and I'd like to thank the professors as well as the TAs for their hard work and dedication on an early Saturday morning.

[END of STUDENT #2's ESSAY]

[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 thinks 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 peoples 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 groups 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 groups 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 groups 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]

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 #2 and #14 based on the provided rubric, I will compare them across the three main criteria: Technical Knowledge and Application, Teamwork and Collaborative Skills, and Reflective Learning and Personal Growth.

Technical Knowledge and Application:

- Student #2: This essay demonstrates a good understanding of the technical aspects of the Train Gap Filler project, detailing the different mechanisms developed and their functionalities. The student explains the process of decision-making, use of design

thinking (WWWWH template), and the practical application in the choice of mechanisms. However, the essay lacks a strong emphasis on innovation or creative problem-solving.

- Student #14: The essay outlines the process of designing questionnaires to understand public perception of high-level radioactive waste disposal. It shows understanding of the societal and technical aspects of the problem, but the focus is more on the process of questionnaire design and analysis rather than technical innovation or detailed problem-solving.

Score:

- #2: +1 (for detailed explanation of technical process and practical application)
- #14: -1 (focus more on process than technical innovation)

Teamwork and Collaborative Skills:

- Student #2: The student identifies their role in researching background information and contributing to the design process. However, there is limited reflection on direct interaction with team members or specific contributions to team dynamics.
- Student #14: The essay details the student's role as an idea giver, analyzer, and translator, showing active engagement in various aspects of the project. There is also a mention of the student's contribution to the analysis and translation tasks, indicating a clear role in the team.

Score:

- #2: -1 (limited details on teamwork and collaborative skills)
- #14: +1 (clear description of role and contributions to the team)

Reflective Learning and Personal Growth:

- Student #2: This essay reflects on the learning experience, mentioning skills gained such as presentation techniques and basic CAD knowledge. There is also an emphasis on the importance of communication in presentations.
- Student #14: The student discusses the importance of sharing ideas and the lessons learned about questionnaire design and public engagement. There is a reflective insight into the challenges faced due to the project's unique nature compared to others.

Score:

- #2: 0 (good reflection on personal learning but lacking depth in project process)
- #14: 0 (reflects well on learning from the project, but more focused on project uniqueness than personal growth)

Overall Comparison:

Based on the above scores, Student #14's essay is slightly superior overall. While both essays have their strengths, #14's essay stands out more in terms of teamwork and collaboration, and #2's essay is stronger in technical knowledge. However, both essays are somewhat comparable in their reflective learning and personal growth.

Final Score:

- Student #2: -1
- Student #14: +1

Student #14's essay slightly edges out Student #2's in overall effectiveness and adherence to the rubric.

