

**The procedure for certification  
in the discipline "Psychiatry, medical psychology",  
for students in the educational program of the specialty  
05.31.01 "General Medicine" (specialist level)  
full-time form of study  
for 2023-2024 academic year**

**1. Methodology for calculating the rating by discipline.**

Final rating by discipline ( $Rd$ ) is calculated by the following formula:

$$Rd = (Rda + Ria) / 2$$

where  $Rd$  – discipline rating

$Ria$  – intermediate assessment rating (exam)

$Rda$  – the average rating of the discipline for the first and second semester is an individual assessment of the mastering of the academic discipline in points for two semesters of study.

The average rating of the discipline for 2 semesters of study is calculated using the following formula:

$$Rda = (R_1 + R_2) / 2$$

where:

$R_1$  – rating by discipline in the 1st semester preliminary

$R_2$  – rating by discipline in the 2nd semester preliminary

The rating for the discipline ( $R$ ) in the 1st and 2nd semester is calculated by the following formula:

$$R = Rc + Rb - Rp$$

where:

$Rc$  – current rating for the first or second semester (current performance, which is assessed by the average score, taking into account tests and marks for independent work)

$Rb$  – bonus rating

$Rp$  – 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.

The final grade that the teacher puts in the record book is the final rating in the discipline ( $Rd$ ), converted into a 5-point system (table 1).

**Table 1.** Final grade for the discipline

Score in a 100-point system	Evaluation according to the system "credited - not credited"	Score in a 5-point system		ECTS
96-100	credited	5	excellent	A
91-95	credited			B
81-90	credited	4	good	C

76-80	credited			D
61-75	credited	3	satisfyingly	E
41-60	not credited	2	unsatisfactorily	Fx
0-40	not credited			F

## 2. Methodology for calculating the average score of the current performance

The rating score for the discipline (Rc) is assessed in total, taking into account the current performance, which is assessed by the average score, taking into account tests and assessment for independent work.

2.1. The knowledge and work of the student in practical classes are evaluated by the teacher in each semester according to the classical 5-point system (Table 2).

**Table 2.** Criteria for evaluating the work of a student in clinical practical classes during an interview on control questions:

Answer characteristic	Competence level	Points	Mark
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 its understanding in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is formulated in terms of science, stated in literary language, logical, conclusive, demonstrates the student's author's position.	high	100–96	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 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.	high	95–91	5
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, 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. The answer is stated in the literary language in terms of science. The answer contains flaws corrected by the student with the help of the teacher.	average	90–86	(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, written in literary language in terms of science. Shortcomings or minor errors corrected by the student with the help of the teacher may be made.	average	85–81	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 "leading" questions from the teacher.	average	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 own.	low	75-71	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. A student can concretize generalized knowledge, proving their main provisions with examples only with the help of a teacher. Speech design requires amendments, correction.	low	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 amendments, correction.	low	65–61	3(3-)
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.	extremely low	60–41	2
No answers were received on the basic questions of the discipline.	extremely low	40–0	2

## 2.2. Test scoring method.

The minimum number of points that can be obtained during testing is 6.1, the maximum is 10 points.

For a correctly completed task, the tested person receives 1 (one) point, for an incorrectly completed task - 0 (zero) points. In the case of tests with multiple choice, the score awarded for one test task is calculated in proportion to the number of correctly selected options. The test is considered passed when a score of 6.1 or higher is obtained. If student receive less than 6.1

points, he must re-pass the test. The evaluation of the results after passing the test is carried out in accordance with Table 3.

**Table 3.** Test scoring criteria.

Percent of right answers	The number of points received for testing	Score on a 5-point system	Test result
91-100	9,1-10	5	Passed
76-90	7,6-9,0	4	Passed
61-75	6,1-7,5	3	Passed
0-60	0-6,0	2	Not passed

For each test conducted in the classroom, the student receives a separate mark, which is considered as the current one. For tests conducted through the educational portal (excluding tests on topics of independent work), the student receives one current grade (**Ta**), which is calculated as:

$$T_a = (T_1 + T_2 + T_3 \dots) / n, \text{ where}$$

**T1, T2, T3...** - scores for each test taken, respectively;

**n** – number of tests passed.

2.3. Independent work of students includes independent study of individual topics provided for by the work program. The form of student reporting is testing (assessment criteria in Table 3), protection of the academic medical history, for students in the intermediary language - preparation of a report on the topic of independent work (Table 4). 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.

**Criteria for assessing academic medical history:**

"5" - "**excellent**" - the medical history is written in full accordance with the scheme recommended by the department, the patient's complaints are transferred, the anamnesis of life and disease is fully stated, the mental status is described fully and without errors, the syndromic diagnosis is established correctly and sufficiently substantiated.

«4» - «**good**» - the history of the disease is written in full accordance with the scheme recommended by the department, the patient's complaints are transferred, the anamnesis of life is set out fully or with the omission of insignificant details for making a diagnosis, the anamnesis of the disease is generally stated correctly, the mental status is described somewhat incompletely, which may affect the setting of a syndromic diagnosis, itself the diagnosis is established correctly and substantiated in the minimum necessary volume.

«3» - «**satisfactorily**» - the medical history as a whole corresponds to the scheme recommended by the department, the complaints and anamnesis are stated correctly, but in insufficient volume to substantiate the diagnosis, the mental status is generally described correctly, but incompletely, which may affect the syndromic diagnosis, the diagnosis itself is either set correctly, but does not have sufficient justification, or established/justified incorrectly.

«2» - «**unsatisfactory**» - the medical history is written with significant deviations from the scheme recommended by the department, complaints and anamnesis are set out carelessly, in insufficient volume or with a large number of systemic inaccuracies, the mental status is absent or described completely incorrectly, the syndromic diagnosis is absent or set incorrectly and has no justification.

**Таблица 4.** Calculation of points for a report on the topic of independent work.

Criteria for evaluation	Score
The work has not been handed over, not handed over in full, the work does not correspond to the subject of independent work.	0-2
The work was submitted in full, but it contained more than 2 gross thematic errors or omitted more than 1 key issue of the topic of independent work.	3
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 omitted.	4
The work has been handed over in full, it does not contain gross thematic errors, the key issues of the topic of independent work are not missed.	5

At the end of each semester, a centralized calculation of the student's average grade is made, in the semester, with its transfer to a 100-point system (Table 5).

**Table 5.** Translation of the average score into 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
5.0	100	4.0	76-78	2.9	57-60
4.9	98-99	3.9	75	2.8	53-56
4.8	96-97	3.8	74	2.7	49-52
4.7	94-95	3.7	73	2.6	45-48
4.6	92-93	3.6	72	2.5	41-44
4.5	91	3.5	71	2.4	36-40
4.4	88-90	3.4	69-70	2.3	31-35
4.3	85-87	3.3	67-68	2.2	21-30
4.2	82-84	3.2	65-66	2.1	11-20
4.1	79-81	3.1	63- 64	2.0	0-10
		3.0	61-62		

### 3. Methodology for calculating the score of the intermediate certification (exam).

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 three questions on all sections of the program studied and a clinical task. The minimum number of points (Ria) that can be obtained during the interview is 61, the maximum is 100 points (Table 6).

**Table 6.** Criteria for assessing the level of assimilation of the material of the discipline and the formation of competencies

Answer characteristics	ECTS	Points	The level of formation of competence in the discipline	Score on a 5-point scale
<p>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</p> <p>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.</p>	A	100–96	HIGH	5 (5+)
<p>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.</p>	B	95–91		5
<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	AVERAGE	4
<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		4 (4-)

<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	LOW	3 (3+)
<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.</p> <p>The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence formation.</p>	E	70-66		3
<p>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.</p> <p>The student demonstrates the threshold level of competencies formation.</p>	E	65-61	THRESHOLD LEVEL OF COMPETENCE FORMATION	3 (3-)
<p>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.</p>	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE ABSENT	2

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
--	---	------	---

For each answer to the question of the examination ticket, the student receives a separate mark according to a 5-point system, which is recorded by the teacher. Final point (**Ria**) for the exam is calculated by the formula:

$$\mathbf{Ria} = (\mathbf{A1+A2+A3+C})/4,$$

where: A1, A2, A3 – mark for the answer to questions 1-3, respectively, C - mark for the answer to the clinical task,

and translated into a 100-point system in accordance with the table "Transfer of the average score to a 100-point system" (Table 5).

If a student receives an unsatisfactory mark in the exam, then the rating in the discipline is equal to the rating of the intermediate certification.

Points for re-passing the exam - no higher than 61 points, regardless of the rating.

#### 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 below (Table 7).

**Table 7.** The system of bonuses and penalties at the department of psychiatry, narcology and psychotherapy.

Kind of work	Number of points (on a 100 point scale)	Number of accruals of bonuses for the course of study
<b>BONUSES</b>		
Production of tables, posters, stands, visual aids, etc.	+3	1 time per course
Participation (publication) in journals: Not peer-reviewed Peer-reviewed Higher attestation commission listed Scopus, Web of Science	+2 +3 +4 +5	for each publication
Participation (publication) in an international conference report publication prize-winning place	+4 +3 +15	for each publication/ participation
Participation in the All-Russian Conference	+3	for each participation



Participation in the regional conference, the final conference of VolgGMU report	+3	for each publication and report on the section on discipline
publication	+2	
1-st prize	+5	
2-nd prize	+4	
3-rd prize	+3	
gratitude	+2	
Report at the meeting of the department scientific society	+1	for every performance
Participation in the "School of Excellence"	+3	1 time per course
<b>PENALTIES</b>		
Missing a lecture for an unexcused reason		-3
Absence on a practical lesson for an unexcused reason		-2
Late for a practical lesson up to 30 minutes, per 1		-1
Practical classes not cleared in a timely manner (more than 10 days after missing for an unexcused reason)		-1
Completion of independent work after the end of the cycle		- 1
Violation of safety precautions and rules of conduct at the department		- 5
Damage to equipment and property		- 5
If a student takes the 2nd ticket in the exam, the answer is scored one point lower		-1

Considered at a meeting of the Department of Psychiatry, Narcology and Psychotherapy  
Protocol No. 9 dated May 30, 2023

Department head



I.I. Zamyatina

30.05.2023