From: HSIEH_JENNIFER
To: evaluations
Cc: HODGES_DIONE
Subject: Please add to Kevin Roberts Spring 2025 evaluation file
Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2025 10:30:25 AM

Hi there,

Would you please add the following email to Kevin Roberts' Spring 2025 evaluation file. I was not able to include it in the adobe sign packet that went out on Monday night.

Thanks,

Jenn

Jennifer M. Hsieh, Ph.D.
Department Chair, Physical Sciences
Professor of Chemistry
Santa Monica College

From: MENACHEKANIAN_EMIN <Menachekanian_Emin@smc.edu>
Sent: Saturday, June 14, 2025 3:12 PM
To: HSIEH_JENNIFER <Hsieh_Jennifer@smc.edu>; FARIDIAN_FOROUZAN <FARIDIAN_FOROUZAN@smc.edu>
Subject: Emin's Grading Sample of Kevin's P22 Exam 3 (Spring 2025)

Hi Jenn and Forouzan,

I hope you got the OneDrive link associated with what I'm writing here in this email. Just to reiterate, I pulled 6 exams from Kevin's 3rd Midterm that I ended up grading. Two were at the high end (with one of these two being a literal perfect score according to him), two were at the low end, and two were in the middle. I've allowed you to access the folder on my OneDrive with all of the materials described below. (The materials overall were altogether too large a file size to include as an email attachment, which is why I had to do it this way.)

- The Exam 3 scans (part of a zip file)
  - Each of these scans starts with Kevin's Gradescope rubric applied to that student. The first few pages show the rubric details, as well as what the student got based on the rubric for each question.
  - Each of these scans has the exam packet with the associated student's work after the rubric information above. I've graded those exams directly on the student's work using my iPad in green.
- My solutions and rubric for Exam 3
  - The solutions fully work out each problem.
  - The associated points next to the solutions constitute my rubric, awarding a certain number of points for certain work shown.
  - I grade all tests based on work shown, and I try to award partial credit accordingly.

An Excel file where I compare what Kevin gave to each student problem by problem, and what I gave. The problem totals are also compiled and compared.

Here are some thoughts I had while grading and ultimately comparing my grading to that of Kevin.

- Some problems are worth too little points, making it very hard to allocate points appropriately based on work shown. Consequently, there's no real reason to make the test worth 100 points. Giving this specific round number as the total makes it too restricting on awarding points appropriately, especially if modifications are not made to the test by, for example, reducing the number of problems.
- I scrutinize the work far more than Kevin, likely because I take more time to grade. This can be seen with how much less points I awarded the students across the board.
    - Case in point: Even without expecting fundamental work and reasoning shown to derive expressions, Kai Lavin got a perfect score; however, there were mistakes in the work that went unnoticed. This was also true for other students, too. You can take a look at the comments I made on the students' work, as well as my rubric.
    - Another case in point: For Problem 7 concerning Dario Sanai (as well as other students), the rubric is a bit lopsided. For one, there's much more thought that goes into Parts A and C, than Part B. Moreover, the sketch in Part D is connected to those previous parts. For Dario, all that was written for Part B was just "0" and yet Dario was awarded the full 3 points for flux not changing, even though the work he had shown for Parts A and C made no sense in terms of what was even being done. There was literally no justification as to why that's the case for Part B in the work. Kevin's rubric says "+3 pts: The flux is not changing so the emf and I are zero." A student could literally just put zero without understanding anything and get 3 points without any justification.
    - Although sometimes students are somewhat makeshift deriving a result, there's no real discussion as to what they're even doing in the first place. Take for example, Problem 8. None of the students really explained what ultimately leads to the "drag" effect imposed when pulling the loop out of the magnetic field. Many of them just put down a string of relevant equations without describing what it was that they were doing in the first place. Again, I've scrutinized them much more for it, and I think for good reason.
- Connecting to the above bullet point, Kevin allows students to bring with them an 8.5" x 11" sheet with both sides filled with literally whatever they want.
    - Based on how Kevin graded the test, it seems like students are getting away too much with not showing any real thought about how to solve a problem. Although the problems are written in a way that doesn't highlight for them to show work, I think it should be made clear that this needs to be done.
        - Case in point: one student, Kai Lavin, got a perfect score on the test, but there were many instances when there wasn't sufficient work shown to warrant such a score. For instance, another student, Andrew Gamm, got a lower score, but I ended up giving them an overall higher score, because they showed way more work and thought than Kai. Again, no offense to the student, but I don't think it makes sense to award someone more points who got the correct answer but showed and justified less work.

- I know that many instructors have a similar policy about bringing in a “cheat sheet,” but if that’s the case, then maybe the problems should be scrutinized even more in such an instance. Personally, it’s why I never allow students to do this, but still provide them with an equation sheet to level the playing field. Of course, then the differentiation between exams is done with what they actually show and do on the exam itself, instead of how much material they’ve been able to pack into their cheat sheet and copy down to solve a specific problem on the test. Again, just my two cents.

I could keep going on about this, but I’m honestly spent on this. Ultimately, it’s true that the top two students in Kevin’s assessment still ended up being the top two students in my assessment. Nevertheless, the student who got a perfect score got a lower score than the other high-scoring student in my assessment. Of course, none of them ended up with a perfect score.

In addition, the adjustments of all the students were quite dramatic, especially for Tae Kim who had practically the same score as Bryan Bae based on Kevin’s assessment, but ended up having a far lower score than Bryan Bae in my assessment. Yes, I know I’m much pickier in the grading, but I think that is especially necessary given the cheat sheet situation. Even with the cheat sheet, students show way less work in forming solutions to problems than what should be acceptable, in my honest opinion.

If you’re having trouble accessing my OneDrive folder, please let me know. Also, let me know if you need anything else. Take care!

-Emin