

**Procedure for conducting an assessment
in the discipline “Jurisprudence”
for students admitted in 2025
under the educational program
31.05.01 General Medicine,
direction (profile) General Medicine
(specialist degree),
full-time study format,
for the 2026–2027 academic year.**

1. General principles for calculating the rating for the discipline.

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

2. Calculation of the preliminary rating components

2.1. General principles

The discipline is studied over one semester (the fourth), so the preliminary rating for the discipline for the entire period of study (R_{prelim}) corresponds to the semester rating of the discipline in the fourth semester (R_{sem}):

$$R_{\text{prelim}} = R_{\text{sem}}$$

The semester rating of the discipline is calculated using the formula:

$$R_{\text{sem}} = (R_{\text{cur}} + R_{\text{siw}}) / 2 + R_{\text{b}} - R_{\text{p}}$$

where R_{cur} is the current rating for the discipline, R_{siw} is the rating for the student’s independent work within the discipline, R_{b} is the bonus rating, R_{p} is the penalty rating.

2.2. Calculation of the current rating for the semester

The current semester rating (R_{cur}) is calculated as the arithmetic mean of all grades received by the student during the semester of studying the discipline while completing tasks for the current assessment of academic performance, which include the following types of tasks: testing, an interview on control questions, solving situational problems, preparing reports and presentations.

The completion of tasks is assessed by the teacher at each seminar class based on the criteria presented below (Table 1) using the classical 5-point scale, where:

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

Table 1

Criteria for the forms of current assessment used

Task type	Evaluation criteria	Rating on a 5-point scale			
		5	4	3	2
Testing	Percentage of correct answers	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61

Interview on control questions	The correctness of the answer	correct	correct	partially correct	incorrect
	Completeness of the answer	complete	quite complete	incomplete	incomplete
	The structure and logic of the answer	structured, logical	mostly structured, logical	poorly structured, logic is disrupted	unstructured, fragmented, chaotic
Solving situational problems (tasks)	The correctness of the received answer	correct	correct	partially correct	incorrect
	The presence, completeness and correctness of the justification for the received answer	Justified without comments	Justified without comments	Partially justified	there is no justification
Presentations	1. Technical assessment: compliance with the deadline for submitting the work; compliance with the formatting requirements.	observed	sufficiently observed	partially observed	not observed
	2. Content assessment: • compliance of the content with the topic; • coverage of the topic; • reflection of all necessary elements of the task in the work; • compliance of the text's style with the type of work.	observed	sufficiently observed	partially observed	not observed
	3. Assessment of the student's analytical work: • adequacy of the source selection • level of analysis (deep/superficial) • analytical tools and presentation of conclusions (including the use of diagrams, examples, illustrations, graphs,	the evaluation criteria are fully disclosed..	the evaluation criteria are sufficiently disclosed.	the evaluation criteria are partially disclosed.	the evaluation criteria are not disclosed

	etc.)				
Reports	1. Technical assessment: • compliance with the performance regulations; • compliance with the requirements for performance elements.	observed	sufficiently observed	partially observed	not observed
	2. Content assessment: • the presence of a structure and logic in the report; • the presence of links and transitions between the parts of the report; • the coverage of the topic in the report.	observed	sufficiently observed	partially observed	not observed
	3. Aesthetic assessment (assessment of oratory skills) (if required): • speech rate; • speech volume; • use of appropriate stylistics and vocabulary.	high level of development in oratory skills	average level of development of oratory skills	low level of oratorical skill development	oratory skills are not developed
	4. Answers to questions based on the report: • psychological readiness to respond • correctness of the arguments in the responses • demeanor	the evaluation criteria are fully disclosed.	the evaluation criteria are disclosed quite fully.	the evaluation criteria are only partially disclosed.	the evaluation criteria have not been disclosed.

At the end of the semester, Rcur is calculated, and the calculated value is converted to a 100-point scale according to Table 2. The absence of current arrears is considered to be an Rcur value exceeding 61 points.

Table 2

Conversion to a rating score on a 100-point system

Average score on a 5-point scale	Score on a 100-point scale	Average score on a 5-point scale	Score on a 100-point scale	Average score on a 5-point scale	Score on a 100-point scale	Average score on a 5-point scale	Score on a 100-point scale
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		

2.3. Calculation of the student's independent work rating for the semester (Rsiw)

The SIW rating for the semester corresponds to the student's grade for completing the electronic SIW course for the given discipline on the electronic information and educational portal of the Volgograd State Medical University of the Ministry of Health of Russia. One semester of studying a discipline includes completing one electronic SIW course.

SIW is assessed based on the criteria presented below (Table 3) using a 100-point scale.

Table 3

SIW assessment criteria

Rating on a 5-point scale

Task type	Evaluation criteria	Rating on a 100-point scale			
		91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61

SIW in the form of an electronic course on the IEEP of VSMU	• Compliance with work deadlines	observed	observed	observed	not observed
	• The completeness of the study of material that is not subject to assessment (viewing presentations, videos)	studied completely	studied completely	studied completely	studied incompletely
	• The average score for current tests and the final test, taking into account the weight (current test: 0.5, final test: 1)	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61

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

2.4. Bonus and penalty rating

Bonuses and penalties are awarded on a 100-point scale. The criteria for bonuses and penalties are set out in Table 4.

Table 4

Bonuses and penalties for compliance with discipline

Bonuses	Name	Points
ERWS	Educational and research work on topics related to the subject being studied.	up to + 5,0
SRWS	Certificate, etc. for a participant in the department's Youth Scientific Community (YSC)	up to + 5,0
Penalties	Name	Points
Disciplinary	Absence from a lecture or seminar without a valid reason	- 2,0
	Systematic tardiness to lectures or seminars	- 1,0
	Violation of safety regulations	- 2,0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2,0

3. Calculation of the interim assessment rating

The interim assessment for the discipline is conducted in the form of a pass/fail and includes the following types of assignments: an interview.

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

Table 5

Criteria for assessing the level of mastery of the discipline's material and the development of competencies.

Characteristics of the answer	Evaluation ECTS	Points in the Score-rating system (SRS)	Level of competence development in the discipline
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is provided; the student demonstrates a set of conscious knowledge about the object, which is evident in their ability to freely handle concepts and to identify its essential and non-essential features, as well as its cause-and-effect relationships. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the backdrop of an understanding of it within the system of the given science and its interdisciplinary connections. The answer is formulated in scientific terms, presented in literary language, is logical and persuasive, and demonstrates the student's authorial position. The student demonstrates a high, advanced level of competence. The interim assessment has been passed.	A	100-96	HIGH
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is provided; the student demonstrates a set of conscious knowledge about the subject; the main points of the topic are presented in a convincing manner; the answer has a clear structure and logical sequence that reflects the essence of the concepts, theories, and phenomena being discussed. Knowledge about the subject is demonstrated against the backdrop of an understanding of it within the system of the given science and its interdisciplinary connections. The answer is written in literary language using scientific terminology. There may be shortcomings in the definition of concepts, which the student corrects independently in the course of the answer. The student demonstrates a high level of competence. The interim assessment has been completed.	B	95-91	
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is provided; the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented in literary language using scientific terminology. Minor shortcomings or minor errors may be present, but they are corrected by the student	C	90-81	AVERAGE

with the teacher's assistance. The student demonstrates a moderately advanced level of competence. The interim assessment has been passed.			
A complete, detailed answer to the question has been provided; the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships has been demonstrated. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented using scientific terminology. However, minor errors or shortcomings have been made, which the student corrected with the help of the teacher's guiding questions. The student demonstrates an adequate level of competence. The interim assessment has been passed.	D	80-76	
A complete but not sufficiently consistent answer to the question has been provided, but the student has demonstrated the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships. The answer is logical and presented in scientific terms. There may be 1–2 errors in defining the main concepts, which the student finds difficult to correct on their own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence. The interim assessment has been passed.	E	75-71	LOW
The answer is insufficiently complete and not sufficiently detailed. The logic and sequence of the presentation are flawed. Errors have been made in defining concepts and using terms. The student is unable to independently identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships. The student can only concretize generalized knowledge by demonstrating its main points with examples, and only with the teacher's help. The speech style requires corrections and adjustments. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence. The interim assessment has been passed.	E	70-66	
The answer is incomplete; the logic and sequence of the presentation have significant flaws. Gross errors have been made in determining the essence of the concepts, theories, and phenomena being discussed, due to the student's failure to understand their essential and non-essential features and relationships. The response lacks conclusions. The student has not demonstrated the ability to identify specific manifestations of generalized knowledge. The speech style requires corrections and adjustments. The student	E	65-61	THRESHOLD

demonstrates a threshold level of competence. The interim assessment has been passed.			
The answer is incomplete and consists of fragmented knowledge on the topic, with significant errors in the definitions. The presentation is fragmented and illogical. The student does not understand the connection between the given concept, theory, or phenomenon and other objects within the discipline. There are no conclusions, no specification, and no evidence in the presentation. The speech is ungrammatical. Additional and clarifying questions from the teacher do not lead to any correction of the student's response — not only to the posed question, but also to other questions within the discipline. There is a lack of competence. The interim assessment has not been passed.	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE ABSENT
No answers have been received regarding the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators of achieving competency development. Competence is absent. The interim assessment has not been passed.	F	40-0	

4. Calculation of the final rating for the discipline

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

$$R_d = (R_{\text{prelim}} + R_{\text{ic}}) / 2$$

The final grade, calculated on a 100-point scale, is converted into a “passed – failed” system according to Table 6.

Table 6

Final grade for the discipline

Score on a 100-point scale	Score on the “passed/failed” scale	Evaluation ECTS
100-96	Passed	A
95-91		B
90-81		C
80-76		D
75-71		E
70-66		
65-61		
60-41	Failed	Fx
40-0		F

Considered at the meeting of the Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and Law, minutes dated May 29, 2026, No. 10.

Head of the Department

 O.V.Kostenko

