# The procedure for certification in the discipline «Hygiene» <br> for students in the educational program <br> specialist in the specialty 33.05.01 Pharmacy focus (profile) Pharmacy, Full-time form of education for 2023-2024 academic year 

Final subject rating $\left(R_{s}\right)$ is calculated using the following formula:

$$
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}=\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{sav}}+\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{is}}\right) / 2
$$

where $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$ - rating by the subject
$R_{i s}$ - rating intermediate certification (credit)
$R_{s a v}$ - the average rating of the subject for the semester of study is an individual assessment of the assimilation of the academic discipline in points for the semester of study.

Average rating disciplines behind semester study calculated By nextformula:

$$
R_{s a v}=R_{s u b j 4},
$$

where:
$R_{\text {subj4 }}$ - rating by the subject for the $4^{\text {th }}$ semester preliminary.
Rating by the subject in $4^{\text {th }}$ semester preliminary calculated By nextformula:

$$
R_{\text {subj4 }}=R_{\text {current }}+R_{b}-R_{f}
$$

Where:
$R_{\text {current }}$ - current rating behind semester (current academic performance, grade which held Byaverage score, with taking into account estimates behind independent work)
$R_{b}$ - rating bonuses
$R_{f}$ - rating fines

The maximum number of points that a student can receive by studying the subject 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 $\left(R_{\text {current }}\right)$ is assessed on the basis of current performance, which is assessed by the average score, taking into account the assessment for independent work

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.

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

Student reporting form preparation of presentation:

1. A separate presentation is prepared for each topic of independent work.
2. Each presentation is made by the student individually.
3. The number of slides in the presentation at the rate of 5 semantic slides for 1 hour. Thus, each presentation should have at least 40 semantic slides.
4. The first slide indicates the topic of the work, full name and group number of the student who completed the work.
5. The last slide should contain a list of literature and Internet resources that the student refers to in his work. Sources must be up-to-date (no more than 5 years from the date of publication, with the exception of individual classical works).
6. On semantic slides there should be no more than 5-10 lines of text (font-14-18).
7. No more than $50 \%$ of the slides may have pictures or tables illustrating the material under consideration.
8. In the full-time format of training, independent work is submitted personally to the teacher in electronic form.
9. In the distance learning format, the completed work is translated into pdf format and posted on the electronic information and educational portal of Volgograd State Medical University in the course of the discipline in the "Independent work" section.
10. Before posting on the educational portal of Volgograd State Medical University, you must correctly name the file being checked with the completed work:
_FULL NAME. student_group, course_Self-work_№__

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).

Table 1. Calculation of points for independent work of students

| Criteria for evaluation | score |
| :--- | :--- |
| The work has not been handed over, not handed over in full, the work does <br> not correspond to the subject of independent work. The design of the work <br> does not fully meet the specified criteria. | 2 |
| The work was submitted in full, but it contained more than 2 gross thematic <br> errors or omitted more than 1 key issue of the topic of independent work. <br> The design of the work partially meets the specified criteria. | 3 |
| The work was submitted in full, but 1-2 gross thematic errors were made in it <br> or 1 key question of the topic of independent work was omitted. There are <br> minor deviations from the specified criteria in the design. | 4 |
| The work has been handed over in full, it does not contain gross thematic <br> errors, the key issues of the topic of independent work are not missed. The <br> design of the work meets the specified criteria | 5 |

At the end of the semester, a centralized calculation of the student's average grade point for the semester is carried out and it is transferred to a 100-point system (Table 2).

Table 2. Translation of the average score of the student's current performance into a rating score according to a 100-point system

| Average <br> score on a | Score on a <br> 100 -point | Average <br> score on a | Score on a <br> 100-point | Average <br> score on a | Score on a <br> 100-point |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 5-point <br> system | system | 5-point <br> system | system | 5-point <br> system | 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 | $61-62$ |  |  |

2. Methodology for calculating the score of the intermediate certification (test) ( $R_{\text {credit }}$ ) Intermediate attestation in the discipline is carried out in the form of a test. The test 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 studied. The minimum number of points $\left(R_{\text {credit }}\right)$ that can be obtained during the interview is 61 , the maximum is 100 points (Table 3).

Table 3. Criteria for assessing the level of assimilation of the material of the discipline and the formation of competencies
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { response characteristic } & \begin{array}{l}\text { ECTS } \\ \text { score }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Points } \\ \text { in BRS }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { The level of } \\ \text { formation of } \\ \text { competence } \\ \text { in the } \\ \text { discipline }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Score on } \\ \text { a 5-point } \\ \text { scale }\end{array} \\ \hline \begin{array}{l}\text { A complete, detailed answer to the question } \\ \text { posed is given, a set of conscious knowledge } \\ \text { about an object is shown, which manifests itself } \\ \text { in the free operation of concepts, the ability to }\end{array} & 100-96 & & 5 \\ \text { distinguish its essential and non-essential } \\ \text { features, causal relationships. Knowledge about } \\ \text { the object }\end{array}\right)$
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.
A complete, detailed answer to the question WITH 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.
A complete, detailed answer to the question D
80-76 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.
A complete, but insufficiently consistent answer E 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.
An insufficiently complete and insufficiently E 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 low level of competence formation.
An incomplete answer is given, the logic and E 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.
An incomplete answer is given, representing fx 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. No answers were received on the basic questions $F$ of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators of the achievement of the formation of competencies. Competence is missing.

## 3. 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 4).

Table 4. Bonuses and penalties by discipline

| Bonuses | Name | Points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| UIRS | Educational and research work on the topics of the subject being studied | before $+5.0$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NIRS | Certificate of participation in the SSS department of the 1st degree | +5.0 |
|  | Certificate of participation in the SSS department of the 2nd degree | +4.0 |
|  | Certificate of participation in the SSS department of the 3rd degree | +3.0 |
|  | Certificate of participation in the SSS department of the 4th degree | + 2.0 |
|  | Certificate of participation in the SSS department of the 5th degree | + 1.0 |
| fines | Name | Points |
| Disciplinary | Missing a lecture or practical session without a valid reason | - 2.0 |
|  | Systematic lateness to lectures or practical classes | -1.0 |
|  | Completing independent work on time | -1.0 |
|  | TB violation | - 2.0 |
| Causing material damage | Damage to equipment and property | - 2.0 |

The final grade that the professor puts in the grade book is the final rating of the subject ( $R_{\text {subj }}$ ), translated into the "pass-fail" system (Table 5).

Table 5. Final grade for the discipline

| Evaluation on a 100point system | Evaluation according to the system "passed - not credited" | Evaluation on a 5-point system |  | ECTS <br> assessment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96-100 | credited | 5 | Great | A |
| 91-95 | credited |  |  | IN |
| 81-90 | credited | 4 | Fine | WITH |
| 76-80 | credited |  |  | D |
| 61-75 | credited | 3 | satisfactorily | E |
| 41-60 | not credited | 2 | unsatisfactory | fx |
| 0-40 | not credited |  |  | F |

Considered at a meeting of the Department of General Hygiene and Ecology on May 24, 2023, protocol No. 9.
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