

**Attestation procedure  
in the discipline "Phthiziatry"  
for students 2021 year of entrance in the educational program  
specialty 31.05.01 "General Medicine",  
(specialty level)  
full time form of education  
for 2025-2026 academic year**

Final discipline rating ( $R_{\partial}$ ) is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_{\partial} = (R_{np\partial} + R_{na})$$

where  $R_{\partial}$  – discipline rating

$R_{na}$  – intermediate certification rating (exam)

where:

$R_{np\partial}$  – intermediate discipline rating in the semester

Intermediate discipline rating in the semester is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_{np\partial} = (R_{mek} + R_{cpo}) / 2 + R_{\phi} - R_{uu}$$

where:

$R_{mek}$  – current rating for the twelfth semester (current performance, which is assessed by the average score, taking into account the assessment for independent work)

$R_{cpo}$  – rating for the independent work

$R_{\phi}$  – bonuses rating

$R_{uu}$  – penalty rating

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 a discipline must be credited is 61.

**1. Methodology for calculating the average score of the current performance**

The rating score for the discipline ( $R_{mek}$ ) is assessed in total, taking into account the current performance, which is assessed by the average score, taking into account the assessment for independent work.

Knowledge and work of a student at practical classes are assessed by the professor using the classical 5-point system.

Independent work of students includes independent study of individual topics provided for by the work program. The form of reporting of students is preparation and defense of an abstract. Each topic of independent work is evaluated from 3 to 5 points, work rated below 3 points is not counted and requires revision by the student (table 1).

Writing an academic medical history by a student includes management of a patient with tuberculosis, the study of the data of medical tests of the supervised patient. The student reporting form is writing an academic medical history. Each medical history is evaluated from 3 to 5 points, work rated below 3 points is not counted and requires revision by the student. Below are the criteria for assessing the academic medical history:

«5» - the work fully complies with the requirements and scheme of registration of the medical history, is written competently, in a literary language, using modern medical terminology. The student demonstrates the conscious application of the acquired knowledge in

characterizing the clinical diagnostic, differential diagnostic and therapeutic aspects of tuberculosis.

«4» - the work fully complies with the requirements and scheme of registration of the medical history, is written competently, in a literary language, using modern medical terminology. The student owns the logic of presentation, highlights the main thing, consciously uses scientific notions, clinical symptoms, diagnostic data, basic methods of treatment, making minor errors and inaccuracies.

«3» - the work meets the requirements and the scheme of registration of the medical history, mistakes were made in the use of terms, interpretation of symptoms, methods of diagnostics and / or treatment.

«2» - the structure of the presentation of the material is violated, errors in the use of terms are made, significant errors in the analysis and presentation of the clinical situation, the written form of the work requires corrections, the results of the clinical examination of the patient are fragmented, without comprehending the relations between the sections, makes mistakes in the interpretation of the clinical picture, diagnostics and treatment of the patient, demonstrates a low degree of understanding and knowledge of tuberculosis, or the medical history does not reflect the pathology of the supervised patient.

At the end of the semester, a centralized calculation of the average student's progress is made, in the semester with its conversion into a 100-point system (Table 2).

Table 1. Calculation of points for independent work of students

Criteria of assessment	Rating points
The work has not been handed over, not handed over in full, the work does not correspond to the subject of independent work.	0-60
The work was submitted in full, but more than 2 gross thematic errors were made in it or more than 1 key question of the topic of independent work was missed.	61-75
The work was submitted in full, but 1-2 gross thematic errors were made in it or 1 key question of the topic of independent work was missed.	76-90
The work has been handed over in full, it does not contain gross thematic errors, key issues of the topic of independent work are not missed.	91-100

Table 2. Conversion of the average score of the student's current performance into a rating score on a 100-point system

Average score on the 5-point system	Score on the 100-point system	Average score on the 5-point system	Score on the 100-point system	Average score on the 5-point system	Score on the 100-point system	Average score on the 5-point system	Score on 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. Methodology of calculating the score of the intermediate certification (exam) ( $R_{na}$ )

Intermediate certification in the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam. The exam takes 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 sections of the program being studied. The minimum number of points ( $R_{na}$ ) that can be obtained during the interview is 61, the maximum is 100 points (Table 4)..

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

Characteristic of the answer	ECTS mark	Points in the PRS	The level of formation of competence in the discipline	Score on a 5-point scale
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 the given 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	5 (5+)

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 the given science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is stated in the literary language in scientific terms. 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		5
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.	C	90–81	MEDIUM	4
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.	D	80-76		4 (4-)
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/her 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 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 corrections. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence formation.	E	70-66		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 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 corrections.  The student demonstrates the threshold level of competencies formation.	E	65-61	THRESHOLD	3 (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 the student's misunderstanding of their essential and non-essential features and relationships. There are no conclusions in the answer. The ability to reveal	Fx	60-41	NO COMPETEN CY	2

specific manifestations of generalized knowledge is not shown. Speech design requires corrections.				
The student demonstrates the threshold level of competencies formation.				
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		2

#### 4. System of bonuses and penalties

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

Table 5. Bonuses and penalties by discipline

Bonuses	Title	Points
ERWS	Educational and research work on the topics of the subject being studied	up to + 5,0
SRWS	Certificate of participation, diploma or etc. in department	up to + 5,0
Penalties	Title	Points
Disciplinary	Missing classes or lectures	- 2,0
	Systemic to be late to lectures or classes	- 1,0
	Violence of hospitals rules	- 1,0
	Non-compliance with safety regulations	- 2,0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2,0

The final mark, which the teacher puts in the record book, is the final rating in the discipline ( $R_0$ ), converted into the 5-point system (table 6).

Table 6. Final mark in the discipline

Mark on the 100-point system	Evaluation according to the system "credited - not credited"	Mark on the 5-point system		Mark on ECTS
100-96	credited	5	excellent	A
95-91				B
90-81		4	good	C
80-76				D
75-71		3	satisfactory	E

70-66				
65-61				
60-41	not credited	2	unsatisfactory	Fx
40-0				F

Considered at the meeting of the department of phtiziopulmonology «30» May 2025,  
protocol No 11

Head of the Department



Olga Nikolaevna Barkanova