

**Procedure for conducting attestation  
in discipline «Hygiene»  
for students of 2024 year of admission  
under the educational programme  
31.05.01 General Medicine,  
specialisation (profile) 31.05.01 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 over two semesters (fourth and fifth), therefore the preliminary rating for the discipline over the entire study period (preliminary rating) ( $R_{prel}$ ) corresponds to the average of the semester ratings in the fourth and fifth semesters:

$$R_{prel} = (R_{sem4} + R_{sem5}) / 2,$$

The semester rating for the discipline is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_{sem} = R_{current} + R_{independent} R / 2 + R_b - R_p$$

where:

- $R_{current}$  – current (ongoing) rating in the discipline,
- $R_{independent}$  – rating for independent work completed by the student within the discipline,
- $R_b$  – bonus rating,
- $R_p$  – penalty rating.

2.2. Calculating the current rating in the semester

The current semester rating ( $R_{current}$ ) is calculated as the arithmetic mean of all grades received by the student during the semester for assignments related to current performance assessment. These assignments include the following types of tasks: solving situational problems, control tests, and oral examinations on control questions.

Each assignment is evaluated by the instructor during seminar-type classes based on the criteria listed below (Table 1), using the standard 5-point grading scale, where:

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

Criteria for the forms used in current assessment

Type of Task	Evaluation Criteria	5-Point Grading Scale			
		5	4	3	2
Solving Situational Problems	• Accuracy of the answer provided	correct	correct	partially correct	incorrect
	• Presence, completeness, and correctness of the justification for the answer	justified, no remarks	justified, with remarks	partially justified	no justification
Control Test	Accuracy of the answers provided	correct	correct	partially correct	incorrect
	Presence, completeness, and correctness of the justification for the answers	justified, no remarks	justified, with remarks	partially justified	-
Oral Examination on Control Questions	Accuracy of the answer	correct	correct	partially correct	incorrect
	Completeness of the answer	complete	sufficiently complete	incomplete	incomplete
	Structure and logic of the answer	structured, logical	mostly structured, logical	poorly structured, illogical	unstructured, fragmented, chaotic

At the end of the semester,  $R_{\text{current}}$  is calculated and the calculated value is converted to a 100-point scale according to Table 3.

$R_{\text{current}}$  value of more than 61 points is considered to be the absence of current debt.

### 2.3. Calculation of the rating of the student's independent work in the semester ( $R_{\text{cpo}}$ )

The IWS rating in a semester corresponds to the student's assessment for completing the essay.

Instructions for completing independent work by a student:

Independent work of students includes independent study of individual topics provided for by the work program.

Form of student reporting - preparation of an essay.

1. A separate abstract is prepared for each topic of independent work.
2. Each abstract is completed by the student individually.
3. The number of pages in the abstract is not less than 12.

4. The title page indicates the topic of the work, the full name and group number of the student who completed the work.

5. Abstract formatting: Times New Roman font (14 pt), justified alignment, paragraph indentation 1.25 cm, line spacing 1.15; margins on the left 2.5 cm, others - 2.0 cm; page numbers at the bottom right; section titles in the middle in bold; do not use word hyphenation.

6. The title page includes: the name of the educational institution, department, discipline, topic of the abstract, course, group, faculty, full name of the student, teacher, city and year of writing the abstract.

7. Sections of the abstract: table of contents, introduction (includes the relevance of the topic, the purpose of the work), the main part (sections are numbered in Arabic numerals: 1.1.; 1.2), conclusion, list of references (designed according to the current GOST, at least 5 sources, from 2014), appendices (if necessary).

8. Independent work is submitted personally to the teacher in printed form.

Each topic of independent work is assessed from 3 to 5 points, work assessed below 3 points is not counted and requires revision by the student.

#### Scoring for students' independent work

The work is not submitted, not submitted in full, the work does not correspond to the topic of independent work - 2

The work is submitted in full, but it contains more than 2 gross thematic errors or more than 1 key question of the topic of independent work is missed - 3

The work is submitted in full, but it contains 1-2 gross thematic errors or 1 key question of the topic of independent work is missed - 4

The work is submitted in full, it does not contain gross thematic errors, key questions of the topic of independent work are not missed - 5

At the end of each study, the student's Rcpo is calculated and the calculated value is converted to a 100-point scale according to Table 3. An Rcpo value of more than 61 points is considered to be the absence of current debt.

#### 2.4. Conversion of the current rating and the independent student's work rating into a score on a 100-point system

At the end of the semester, the current rating and the independent student's work rating, calculated on a 5-point system, are converted into a score on a 100-point system. The conversion is made according to Table 3.

Table 3

Conversion into a rating point on a 100-point system

Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 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. Bonus and Penalty Rating

Bonuses and penalties are set on a 100-point scale. Bonus and penalty criteria are given in Table 4.

Table 4

### Bonuses and penalties for discipline

Bonuses	Наименование	Баллы
UIRS	Educational and research work on the topics of the subject being studied	до + 5,0
NIRS	Certificate, diploma, etc. of a participant in the department's MNO	до + 5,0
Fines	Name	Баллы
Disciplinary	absence without a valid reason from a lecture or practical lesson	- 2,0
	Failure to complete an assignment in practical lessons	- 2,0
	Systematic lateness to lectures or practical lessons	- 1,0
	Violation of safety regulations	- 2,0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and prop	- 2,0

## 3. Calculation of the intermediate attestation rating

The midterm assessment for the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam and includes the following types of tasks: an interview on questions for midterm assessment, solving a situational problem.

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

Table 5

**Criteria for assessing the level of assimilation of the discipline material and the formation of competencies**

Response characteristic	ECTS score	Points in BRS	The level of formation of competence in the discipline
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, a set of conscious knowledge about an object is shown, which manifests itself in the free operation of concepts, the ability to distinguish its essential and non-essential features, causal relationships. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is formulated in terms of science, stated in literary language, logical, evidential, demonstrates the author's position of the student. The student demonstrates a high advanced level of competence formation	A	100–96	HIGH
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, a set of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, the main provisions of the topic are convincingly disclosed; the answer shows a clear structure, a logical sequence that reflects the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, phenomena. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of its understanding in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is stated in the literary language in terms of science. There may be errors in the definition of concepts, corrected by the student independently in the process of answering. The student demonstrates a high level of competence formation.	B	95-91	

<p>A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential features, causal relationships is shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, written in literary language in terms of science. Shortcomings or minor errors may be made, corrected by the student with the help of the teacher. The student demonstrates an average increased level of competence formation.</p>	C	90-81	<p style="text-align: center;">AVERAGE</p>
<p>A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential features, causal relationships is shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, stated in terms of science. However, minor errors or shortcomings were made, corrected by the student with the help of the "leading" questions of the teacher. The student demonstrates an average sufficient level of competence formation.</p>	D	80-76	
<p>A complete, but insufficiently consistent answer to the question is given, but 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. 1-2 mistakes can be made in the definition of basic concepts that the student finds it difficult to correct on his own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence formation.</p>	E	75-71	<p style="text-align: center;">SHORT</p>
<p>An insufficiently complete and insufficiently detailed answer is given. The logic and sequence of presentation have violations. Mistakes were made in the disclosure of concepts, the use of terms. The student is not able to independently identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships. The student can concretize generalized knowledge, proving their main provisions with examples only with the help of a teacher. Speech design requires amendments, correction. The student demonstrates an extremely</p>	E	70-66	

low level of competence formation.			
An incomplete answer is given, the logic and sequence of presentation have significant violations. Gross mistakes were made in determining the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, phenomena, due to the student's misunderstanding of their essential and non-essential features and relationships. There are no conclusions in the answer. The ability to reveal specific manifestations of generalized knowledge is not shown. Speech design requires amendments, correction. The student demonstrates the threshold level of competencies formation.	E	65-61	THRESHOLD
An incomplete answer is given, representing scattered knowledge on the topic of the question with significant errors in the definitions. There is fragmentation, illogical presentation. The student does not realize the connection of this concept, theory, phenomenon with other objects of the discipline. There are no conclusions, concretization and proof of presentation. Speech is illiterate. Additional and clarifying questions of the teacher do not lead to the correction of the student's answer not only to the question posed, but also to other questions of the discipline. Competence is missing.	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE ABSENT
No answers were received on the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators of the achievement of the formation of competencies. Competence is missing.	F	40-0	

#### 4. Calculation of the final rating for the discipline

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

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

where:

$R_{\text{prel}}$  - preliminary rating

$R_{\text{ic}}$  - rating intermediate certification (credit)

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

Table 6

Final grade for the discipline			
Evaluation on a 100-point system	Evaluation on a 5-point system		ECTS assessment
96-100	5	Great	A
91-95			IN
81-90	4	Fine	WITH
76-80			D
61-75	3	satisfactorily	E
41-60	2	unsatisfactory	fx
0-40			F

Considered at the department meeting of the Department of General Hygiene and Ecology of the N.P. Grigorenko Institute of Public Health, protocol of «23» May 2025. № 10.



Head of the Department

N.I. Latyshevskaya