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**PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE 2**

PROJECT EVALUATION

peer-assessment and project contribution

**STUDENT NAME & U-NUMBER:**

|  |
| --- |
| Han Zhang u7235649 |

**STUDENT SUMMARY INFORMATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Workshop Group No.** | | Workshop 4 Group 3 |
| Workshop group members (please also label with \*\* those people in your group project): | | |
| 1. | Chenhao Zhang \*\* | |
| 2. | Puxi Cao \*\* | |
| 3. | Hang Su \*\* | |
| 4. | Yifan Zhou \*\* | |
| 5. |  | |
| 6. |  | |

**INDIVIDUAL REFLECTION PIECE (<700 words)**

|  |
| --- |
| The problem that our responsible innovation project is trying to solve is the post-harvest loss and market problems of agricultural products in Singida, Tanzania. However, our solutions and the process of proposing solutions have many shortcomings. This gave me a deeper thinking about how to be responsible when developing solutions to problems.  The first is to consider all the stakeholders. This may not only reach the level of the groups, but also need to reach everyone in each group, especially those with special needs. In our initial design, we considered creating a web page to help multiple countries in need. But after tutor reminded, we realized that this may not help everyone we hope to help. For example, there are some tribes in Africa who need help, but hey use their own languages that have no words. We have considered translating the website into different languages, but we are unable to provide the website in these languages. Although we did not adopt this plan in the end, I am still considering how to solve similar problems. Before proposing a plan, we should carefully consider each relevant person, taking into account their specific and individual needs. Regarding the language problem above, I think it might be a possible way to find volunteers offline to help them. In the future, I will pay more attention to the analysis and consideration of stakeholders, collect information more comprehensively, and try to consider everyone.  In addition, I am also aware of the importance of systems thinking. Many systems may not be independent, and their operation is based on the support of other systems as well as the local situation. Especially in countries and areas with weak infrastructure, the development of high-tech industries may not be as easy as we thought. For instance the website that we conceived at the beginning, in some countries, the network construction is not very perfect, there may be many people who cannot use the network, so they cannot get help from our website. The integrated model of sorghum storage and processing we proposed later also relies on the relatively convenient transportation industry in the Singida area. For a responsible solution, system thinking can help identify the constraints that may be involved in the plan, and ensure the smooth, stable, and long-term operation of the plan. It is impossible to succeed in implementing programs that lack the support of other systems. When solving problems in the future, I will fully consider the situation and the related systems, avoid unrealistic fantasies, and propose reasonable and long-term solutions, and try to solve the problem from the root.  The last point is problem refactoring. Problem refactoring helps us to fully understand the problem and solve the right problem, but this is sometimes ignored by us or even some governments. In our project, we try to solve the storage and processing of agricultural products. However, climate restrictions, behindhand farming methods and informal marketing are still the main reasons that restrict local farmers from increasing their income. Even the community granaries promoted by the government were underutilized because the problem of the informal marketing still existed. In the future work, I will try to be critical and ask questions, find the real cause of the problem, find the best solution, and solve the problem from the root cause as much as possible. Who, where, when, what, how and why can be good questions. On this basis, hypotheses can be tested and developed to reframe the problem, thus better understand the cause of the problem or of the missing problem in the comparison case.  In conclusion, through the study and workshop project this semester, I have a deeper understanding and thinking about responsible solutions and how to put forward them. In my future work, I will try to use these knowledge and skills to come up with responsible solutions and become a responsible software engineer. |

**PEER EVALUATION and CONTRIBUTION CHARACTERISATION**

*How would you characterize the functioning of your group project task and team in its final stage? Please fill out the following table, marking ‘x’ at the appropriate place in the scale.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Thinking about your whole group, please respond on the Likert scale to the following statements:* | *Strongly Agree* | *Agree* | *Neither agree nor disagree* | *Disagree* | *Strongly Disagree* |
| **Group project** | | | | | |
| Our group members are all satisfied with the project and we are all happy |  | √ |  |  |  |
| Our group members have all been able to apply their skills and interests to the project during the semester |  | √ |  |  |  |
| The group has made good progress after we received feedback from the tutor |  | √ |  |  |  |
| Each group member has adequately contributed to the project task |  | √ |  |  |  |
| **Team functioning** | | | | | |
| Our group members all respect each other |  | √ |  |  |  |
| Our group members all acknowledge and appreciate each others different skills |  | √ |  |  |  |
| Our group has a positive culture and way of working |  | √ |  |  |  |
| Our group has found ways to value the contributions of each member |  | √ |  |  |  |
| Our group has found ways to harness productive conflict and constructive criticism |  |  | √ |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Now think individually about what levels you and your colleagues are performing at* | *Level of task effort* | *Quality of work / discussion / facilitation so far* | *Level of attention to team functioning* | *Quality of behaviour* |
| *Mark in each box below each criterion as: 5 – Outstanding; 4 – very good; 3 – good; 2 – satisfactory; 1 – unsatisfactory/poor* | | | | |
| **Han Zhang** | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Puxi Cao | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| Hang Su | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Yifan Zhou | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Chenhao Zhang | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Note - please compare your team 'internally'. That is, we understand that everyone is ‘very good', but by definition not everyone can be ‘very good' within your team, and by choosing this for all members you demonstrate that you do not understand the purpose of this evaluation form.*

*CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT*

*To complement and explain the above ratings, please provide a comment on who has contributed what to the task and group work. Please refer to all group members including yourself. This can be in terms of background reading, strategic thinking/past experience, team management (e.g. logistics, deadline setting), stakeholder liaison, team culture and happiness (e.g. making people feel welcome and listened to), written preparation activities, etc. (100-300 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| Puxi Cao organized some meetings, provided strategic thinking, participated in team management and made presentation slides.  Hang Su gave some strategic thinking, provided background reading, organized some meetings and participated in team management.  Chenhao Zhang provided background reading, key suggestions, and made everyone happy.  Yifan Zhou provide background reading and give some thinking.  I participated in the deadline setting, conducted background reading, provided some past experience and made the podcast.  We all participated in discussions, report writing and the podcast. |

**COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND RELEVANCE (optional)**

*Provide a brief overview of to what extent your course expectations were met, not met or surpassed, and why. For example, you could comment on specific lessons that led to a changing perception of the courses’ value for your life and career aspirations. Or issues that didn’t allow you to reach your potential (100-300 words).*

|  |
| --- |
|  |