Procedure for conducting attestation
in discipline/practice «Chemistry of biogenic elements»
for students of 2025 year of admission
under the educational programme
33.05.01 Pharmacy,
specialisation (profile) Pharmacy
(Specialist's degree),
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

R preliminary – discipline average rating for the first semester – individual assessment of the assimilation of the discipline in points for the semester of study.

R preliminary = *Rpr1*

where:

Rpr1 is the rating for the discipline in the 1nd semester

preliminary

The rating for the discipline in the 2nd and 3rd semesters is preliminary calculated according to the following formula:

Rpr = (R current + Riw) / 2 + Rb – Rp

where:

Rcurrent is the current rating for the first semester (current academic performance, which is assessed according to the average score, taking into account tests and control papers).
Riw is the rating for account the assessment for independent work in the first semester.
Rb – bonus rating
R p – penalty rating

New types of rating were not introduced in the final semester of the discipline (spec. theory and

spec.pract).

The maximum number of points that a student can receive in a discipline in a semester is 100. The minimum number of points at which the discipline should be credited is 61.

2.2. Calculating the current rating in the semester

1. The method of calculating the average score of current academic performance.

The rating score for the discipline (Rcurrent) is evaluated in total, taking into account the current academic performance, the assessment of which is carried out according to the average score, taking into account the assessment for independent work.

The student's knowledge and work in practical classes are evaluated by the teacher in each semester, according to the classical 5-point system.

2.3. Calculation of the rating of independent work of a student in a semester (Rcpo)

Independent work of students includes independent study of individual topics provided for in the work program. The students' reporting form is answers to questions and tests in lectures on the topics of independent work. Each topic of independent work is rated from 3 to 5 points, work rated below 3 points is not counted and requires completion by the student (Table 1).

Table 1. Calculation points for independent work of students

Evaluation criteria	Rating score
The work has not been completed, it has not been completed in full, the work does not correspond to the subject of independent work.	0-2
The work was submitted in full, but it made more than 2 rough thematic mistakes or missed more than 1 key question of the topic of independent work.	3
The work has been submitted in full, but 1-2 rough thematic errors have been made in it or 1 key question of the topic of independent work has been missed.	4
The work has been completed in full, there are no rough thematic errors in it, the key issues of the topic of independent work have not been missed.	5

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 each semester, a centralized calculation of the student's average academic performance is performed, in the semester with its transfer to the 100-point system (Table 2).

Table 2. Conversion of the average score of the current academic performance, including the student's independent work into a rating score according to 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
4,95	99	3,40	69	2,46	39
4,90	98	3,35	68	2,44	38
4,85	97	3,30	67	2,42	37
4,80	96	3,25	66	2,40	36
4,75	95	3,20	65	2,38	35
4,70	94	3,15	64	2,36	34
4,65	93	3,10	63	2,34	33
4,60	92	3,05	62	2,32	32
4,5	91	3,00	61	2,30	31
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

This rating score calculation model provides bonuses that increase the rating score and penalties that lower the rating, according to the table below (Table 5).

Table 5. Bonuses and penalties for discipline

Bonuses	title	Points
ERWS	Educational and research work on the topics of the studied subject	up to + 5,0
SRWS	Certificate of the participant of the Student scientific society department of the 1st degree	+ 5.0
	Certificate of the participant of the Student scientific society of the department of the 2nd degree	+ 4.0
	Certificate of the participant of the Student scientific society of the department of the 3rd degree	+ 3.0
	Certificate of the participant of the Student scientific society of the department of the 4th degree	+ 2.0
	Certificate of the participant of the Student scientific society of the department of the 5th degree	+ 1.0
Penalties	title	Points
Disciplinary	omission of lectures or practical classes without a valid reason	- 2.0
	Systematic lateness to lectures or practical classes	- 1.0
	Performing independent work not on time	- 1.0
	violation of safety regulations	- 2.0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2.0

3. Calculation of the intermediate attestation rating

The method of calculating the intermediate certification score (exam) (Rintermediate)

Intermediate certification in the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam. The exam takes place in the form of an interview with an assessment of the formation of the practical component of the competencies being formed, which includes questions on all

the studied sections of the program. The minimum number of points (Rintermediate) that can be obtained during an interview is 61, the maximum is 100 points (Table 4).

Table 4. Criteria for assessing the level of assimilation of discipline material and the formation of competencies.

Response Characteristics	ECTS assessment	Points in BRS	The level of professional competence in the discipline is formed	Rating on a 5-point scale
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the totality of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, manifested in the free operation of concepts, the ability to distinguish its essential and non-essential signs, cause-and- effect 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, presented 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	5 (5+)
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 disclosed; a clear structure, logical sequence is traced in the answer, reflecting the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, phenomena. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is presented in literary language in terms of science. There may be shortcomings in the definition of concepts, corrected by the student himself	B	95–91	high	5

in the process of answering. The student demonstrates a high level of competence formation.				
A full, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non- essential features is shown, causal relationships. The answer is clearly structured, logical, presented in literary language in terms of science. There may be shortcomings or minor errors corrected by the student with the help of a teacher. The student demonstrates an average increased level of competence formation.	C	90–81	average	4
A full, 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, stated in terms of science. However, minor mistakes or shortcomings 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.	D	80-76	average	4 (4-)
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 the definition of basic concepts that the student finds it difficult to correct on their own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence formation.	E	75-71	low	3 (3+)

An insufficiently complete and insufficiently detailed answer is given. The logic and sequence of the 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 signs and cause-and-effect relationships. A student can concretize generalized knowledge by proving their main points by examples only with the help of a teacher. Speech design requires corrections, corrections. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence formation.	E	70-66	low	3
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 students' misunderstanding of their essential and non-essential 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, corrections. The student demonstrates the threshold level of competence formation.	E	65-61	threshold	3 (3-)

An incomplete answer is given, which represents scattered knowledge on the topic of the question with significant errors in definitions. There is fragmentary, 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 evidence-based presentation. The speech is illiterate. Additional and clarifying questions from the teacher do not lead to correction of the student's answer not only to the question posed, but also to other questions of the discipline. There is no competence.	Fx	60-41	There is no competence.	2
No answers were received on the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators of achieving the formation of competencies. There is no competence.	F	40-0	There is no competence.	2

4. Calculation of the final rating for the discipline

The final grade that the teacher puts in the record book is the final rating for the discipline (Rd), translated into a 5-point system (Table 6).

$$Rd = (R_{preliminary} + R_{intermediate}) / 2$$

where
Rd is the rating for the discipline
R intermediate– intermediate certification rating (exam)

Table 6. Final assessment of the discipline

Assessment according to the 100-point system	Assessment according to the system "credited - not credited"	Assessment according to the 5-point system	
96-100	counted	5	excellent
91-95	counted		
81-90	counted	4	good
76-80	counted		

61-75	counted	3	satisfactory
41-60	not credited	2	unsatisfactory
0-40	not credited		

Considered at the meeting of the department of Chemistry "30" May 2025 y, protocol No10

Head of the Department of Chemistry, professor  A.K. Brel