

**Procedure for conducting attestation
in discipline «General surgery»
for students of 2023, 2024 year of admission
under the educational programme
31.05.01 General medicine,
specialisation General medicine
Specialist's,
form of study full-time
for the 2025-2026 academic year**

1. General principles for calculating the rating in the discipline

The rating for a discipline is an individual assessment of the student's study of the discipline, which consists of the rating for the entire period of study of the discipline (preliminary rating) and the rating of the intermediate attestation.

2. Calculation of preliminary rating components

2.1. General principles

The discipline is studied during two semesters (fourth and fifth), therefore, the preliminary rating of the discipline for the entire period of study (RPS) corresponds to the average semester rating of the discipline in the fourth and fifth semesters:

$$R_{дсп} = (R_{пред4} + R_{пред5}) / 2$$

The semester rating of the discipline is calculated according to the formula:

$$R_{сем} = (R_{тек} + R_{срo}) / 2 + R_{б} - R_{ш}$$

where: $R_{тек}$ – current ranking by discipline,

$R_{срo}$ – student's independent work rating within the discipline,

$R_{б}$ – bonus rating,

$R_{ш}$ – penalty rating.

2.2. Calculation of the current semester ranking

The current semester rating ($R_{тек}$) is calculated as the arithmetic average of all the grades received by the student during the semester of studying the discipline when performing the tasks of the current academic performance control, which include the following types of tasks: testing and (or) control work, solving situational problems, interviewing control questions, assessment of the development of practical skills (abilities).

The teacher evaluates the completion of tasks in each seminar-type lesson based on the criteria presented below (Table 1) on a classic 5–point scale, where:

2 is unsatisfactory;

3 – satisfactory;

4 – good;

5 – excellent.

Table 1

Criteria for the current certification forms used

Task type	Evaluation criteria	Rating on a 5-point scale			
		5	4	3	2
Testing	• The percentage of correct answers	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61
Solving situational task	• The accuracy of the received response	true	true	partially correct	incorrect

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability, completeness and correctness of the justification of the received response 	justified without comments	justified with comments	justified	there is no justification
Control work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The accuracy of the received response 	true	true	partially correct	incorrect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability, completeness and correctness of the justification of the received response 	justified without comments	justified with comments	justified	-
Interview on control issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct response <i>ернось ответа</i> 	true	true	partially correct	incorrect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of the response 	complete	fairly complete	incorrect	incorrect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The structure and logic of the response 	structured, logical	basically structured, logical	it is poorly structured, the logic is broken	unstructured, fragmented, chaotic
Assessment of the development of practical skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the theoretical foundations of performing a skill 	knowledge	knowledge	uncertain knowledge	lack of knowledge
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with the technique of performing the skill and the success of the result 	compliance, successful outcome	compliance with minor inaccuracies, a successful result	completing the skill only after the teacher's correction is a successful result	an attempt to perform a skill that does not lead to a successful result, refusal to perform the skill
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidence and stability of skill performance 	confidence and stability	lack of confidence in overall stability	uncertainty, repetition of mistakes when replaying a skill	

At the end of the semester, the Rtec is calculated and the calculated value is converted to a 100-point scale according to Table 3. The absence of current debt is considered to be an Rtek value of more than 61 points.

2.3. Calculation of the student's independent work rating in the semester (Rcro)

The SRO rating in the semester corresponds to the student's assessment for completing the SRO electronic training course in this discipline on the electronic information and educational portal of the Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Medical Education of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation. One semester of study of the discipline includes the implementation of one e-learning course SRO.

The SRO is evaluated based on the criteria presented below (Table 2) on a classical 5-point scale, where:

- 2 – unsatisfactory;
- 3 – satisfactory;
- 4 – good;
- 5 – excellent.

Table 2

SRO assessment criteria

Task type	Evaluation criteria	Rating on a 5-point scale			
		5	4	3	2
SRO in the form of an electronic course/course element at the VolgGMU EIOP	• Meeting deadlines for work completion	complied with	complied with	complied with	not complied with
	• Completeness of the study of the material	studied in full	studied in full	studied in full	it has not been fully studied
	• Completion of current test tasks (% of correct answers in each test)	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61
	• Completing the final assessment section	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61

At the end of each study, the student's Rcro is calculated and its calculated value is converted to a 100-point scale according to Table 3.

The absence of current debt is considered to be an Rrr value of more than 61 points.

2.4. Transfer of the current rating and the SRO rating to the 100-point system

At the end of the semester, the student's current rating and SRO rating, calculated in a 5-point system, are converted to a score based on a 100-point system. The transfer is made according to Table 3.

Table 3

Conversion to a 100-point rating system

The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system
5,00	100	3,45	70	2,48	40	2,09	10
4,95	99	3,40	69	2,46	39	2,08	9
4,90	98	3,35	68	2,44	38	2,07	8
4,85	97	3,30	67	2,42	37	2,06	7
4,80	96	3,25	66	2,40	36	2,05	6
4,75	95	3,20	65	2,38	35	2,04	5
4,70	94	3,15	64	2,36	34	2,03	4
4,65	93	3,10	63	2,34	33	2,02	3
4,60	92	3,05	62	2,32	32	2,01	2
4,5	91	3,00	61	2,30	31	2,00	1

4,47	90	2,98	60	2,29	30		
4,43	89	2,95	59	2,28	29		
4,40	88	2,93	58	2,27	28		
4,37	87	2,90	57	2,26	27		
4,33	86	2,88	56	2,25	26		
4,30	85	2,85	55	2,24	25		
4,27	84	2,83	54	2,23	24		
4,23	83	2,80	53	2,22	23		
4,20	82	2,78	52	2,21	22		
4,17	81	2,75	51	2,20	21		
4,13	80	2,73	50	2,19	20		
4,10	79	2,70	49	2,18	19		
4,07	78	2,68	48	2,17	18		
4,03	77	2,65	47	2,16	17		
4,00	76	2,63	46	2,15	16		
3,90	75	2,60	45	2,14	15		
3,80	74	2,58	44	2,13	14		
3,70	73	2,55	43	2,12	13		
3,60	72	2,53	42	2,11	12		
3,50	71	2,50	41	2,10	11		

2.5. Rating of bonuses and penalties

Bonuses and fines are awarded according to a 100-point system. The criteria for bonuses and penalties are given in Table 4.

Table 4

Discipline bonuses and penalties

Bonuses	Name	Scores
УИРС	Educational and research work on the topics of the subject under study	до + 5,0
НИРС	Certificate, diploma, diploma, etc. of the participant of the Department of MNO	до + 5,0
Penalties	Name	Scores
Disciplinary measures	Skipping a lecture or practical lesson without a valid reason	- 2,0
	Working off practice passes later than the 14-day deadline	- 2,0
	Systematic lateness to lectures or practical exercises	- 1,0
	Violation of safety regulations	- 2,0
	Performing independent work not on time	- 2,0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2,0

3. Calculation of the intermediate assessment rating

The intermediate certification in the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam and includes the following types of tasks: an interview.

The assessment of the student's level of formation of the necessary competencies is carried out on a 100-point scale according to the criteria in Table 5.

Table 5

Критерии Criteria for assessing the level of assimilation of the discipline's material and the formation of competencies

Response characteristics	estimation ECTS	Points in the BRS	The level of competence formation in the discipline
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, and the totality of conscious knowledge about an object is shown, manifested in the free operation of concepts, the ability to identify its essential and non-essential features, and cause-and-effect relationships. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of its understanding in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is formulated in terms of science, presented in literary language, logical, evidence-based, demonstrates the author's position of the student. The student demonstrates a high advanced level of competence formation. Intermediate certification passed.	A	100-96	HIGH
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the totality of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, the main provisions of the topic are evidently revealed; a clear structure and logical sequence can be traced in the answer, reflecting the essence of the concepts, theories, and phenomena being disclosed. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of its understanding in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is presented in literary language in terms of science. There may be errors in the definition of concepts, corrected by the student himself in the process of responding. The student demonstrates a high level of competence formation. Intermediate certification passed.	B	95-91	
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential signs, cause-and-effect relationships is shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented in literary language in terms of science. There may be mistakes or minor mistakes that are corrected by the student with the help of the teacher. The student demonstrates an average increased level of competence formation. Intermediate certification passed.	C	90-81	AVERAGE
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential signs, cause-and-effect relationships is shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented in terms of science. However, minor errors or omissions were made, corrected by the student with the help of "leading" questions from the teacher. The student demonstrates an average sufficient level of competence formation. The intermediate certification has been completed.	D	80-76	

<p>A complete but insufficiently consistent answer to the question is given, but at the same time the ability to identify essential and non-essential signs and cause-and-effect relationships is shown. The answer is logical and stated in terms of science. There may be 1-2 mistakes in defining basic concepts that the student finds difficult to correct on their own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence formation. Intermediate certification passed.</p>	E	75-71	AVERAGE
<p>An insufficiently complete and insufficiently detailed answer has been given. The logic and sequence of the presentation have violations. Mistakes were made in the disclosure of concepts and the use of terms. The student is not able to independently identify essential and non-essential signs and cause-and-effect relationships. A student can concretize generalized knowledge by proving its main points by examples only with the help of a teacher. Speech design requires corrections and corrections. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence formation. The intermediate certification has been completed.</p>	E	70-66	
<p>An incomplete answer is given, and the logic and sequence of the presentation have significant violations. Gross errors were made in determining the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, and phenomena, due to students' misunderstanding of their essential and nonessential features and connections. There are no conclusions in the response. The ability to reveal specific manifestations of generalized knowledge is not shown. Speech design requires corrections and corrections. The student demonstrates a threshold level of competence formation. Intermediate certification passed.</p>	E	65-61	THRESHOLD
<p>An incomplete answer is given, representing scattered knowledge on the topic of the question with significant errors in definitions. There is fragmentary and illogical presentation. The student is not aware of the connection of this concept, theory, phenomenon with other objects of the discipline. There are no conclusions, concretization, and evidence-based presentation. The speech is illiterate. Additional and clarifying questions from the teacher do not lead to a correction of the student's answer, not only to the question posed, but also to other questions of the discipline. There is no competence. Intermediate certification failed.</p>	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE ABSENT
<p>No answers have been received on the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators for achieving competence formation. There is no competence. The intermediate certification has not been completed.</p>	F	40-0	

4. Calculation of the final rating for a discipline

The final grade in the discipline (Rd) is calculated using the formula:

$$R_d = (R_{pb} + R_{pa}) / 2$$

The final score calculated in a 100-point system is converted to a 5-point system according to Table 6..

Table 6

Final assessment of the discipline

100-point rating system	5-point rating system (for a test with an assessment, an		Estimation ECTS
100-96	5	excellent	A
95-91			B
90-81	4	good	C
80-76			D
75-61	3	satisfactory	E
60-41	2	unsatisfactory	Fx
40-9			F

Considered at the department meeting of General Surgery,
protocol of «02» June's 2025 г., № 14.

Head of the Department _____  S.I. Panin