

**Attestation procedure  
in the discipline "ISSUES OF GERONTOLOGY"  
for students of the educational program  
Specialist degree  
in the specialty 31.05.01 General Medicine,  
direction (profile): General Medicine,  
form of study: Full-time form  
for the 2023-2024 academic year**

**Rd** – final rating score for the discipline «Issues of gerontology» is calculated from rating scores for 7<sup>th</sup> semester and rating score for the credit, translated according to the system «credited – not credited».

Rd is calculated according to the formula:

$$\mathbf{Rd} = (\mathbf{Rmp} + \mathbf{Ri}) / 2,$$

where

**Rmp** – mean preliminary rating score is the rating score for 7<sup>th</sup> semester prior to the credit.

**Ri** - mean rating score for the intermediate attestation (credit)

Preliminary rating score for the 7th semester is calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{Rmp} = (\mathbf{R}_c + \mathbf{R}_t) / 2 + \mathbf{bonus\ points} - \mathbf{penalty\ points}$$

where:

**R<sub>c</sub>** – current rating in the 7<sup>th</sup> semester calculated as the arithmetic mean for all the rating points gained during the semester, including the independent work. Independent work of students includes independent study of regulatory and legal documents, work with a geriatrician in a hospital and/or at an outpatient department, preparation of a report/or presentations on one of the suggested topics. The form of the independent work report is a report. The independent work is evaluated from 61 to 100 points; work rated below 61 points is not counted and requires completion by the student (Table 1).

**Table 1. Calculation of 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	0-60
The work was completed in full, but it made more than 2 gross thematic errors	61-75
The work was completed in full, but it made 1-2 gross thematic errors	76-90
The work has been completed in full, there are no gross thematic errors in it, key questions have not been missed	91-100

**R<sub>t</sub>**. testing rating score is calculated as arithmetic mean of all individual testing scores for each topic for of seminar-type classes at the educational portal.

At the end of the semester the teacher calculates the mean grade and translates the value to rating score using the 0-100 scale (see table 2).

**Table 2. Translating mean grade into rating points**

Five-mark grading system	Points on 0-100 scale	Five-mark grading system	Points on 0-100 scale	Five-mark grading system	Points on 0-100 scale
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		

**Calculating rating score for credit (Re):**

The intermediate attestation is performed as a credit. The credit covers all areas covered in course. Only those students are allowed to take the credit whose mean rating score is 61 and above and who meet all course requirements. Students who fail the credit are allowed to take it two more times, according to the department schedule.

The examination on the discipline «Issues of gerontology» includes an interview with a teacher on examination questions, as well as an assessment of the level of competence formation (practical skills).

**Table 3. Criteria for evaluation of student performance on the credit**

Student performance	ECTS	Points on 0-100 scale	Competence formation	Mark on 1-5 scale
An excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The student demonstrates excellent judgement and a very high degree of independent thinking. High advanced competence level.	A	100–96	HIGH	5 (5+)
Above average standards, with minor errors. The student demonstrates sound judgement and a high degree of independent thinking. High competence level.	B	95–91		5
Generally sound work, with some errors. The student demonstrates a reasonable degree of judgment and independent thinking in the most important areas. The student expands on answer by giving additional explanation, and then extends that information by explaining the additional features and clinical relations using medical terminology. Medium high competence level.	C	90–81	MEDIUM	4
Fair, but with significant shortcomings. The student demonstrates a limited degree of judgement and independent thinking. The student gives an example	D	80-76		4 (4-)

to demonstrate his/her understanding of the definition using some anatomical models and organs. Medium sufficient competence level.				
Performance meets minimum criteria. The student demonstrates a very limited degree of judgement and independent thinking. This answer makes appropriate use of the names of the organs (formal and actual (latin and greek terminology)). The student connects those names to the correct clinical significance with some errors. Low competence level.	E	75-71	LOW	3 (3+)
Partially correct answers, recurring errors (an earlier error that makes the rest of the answer wrong). The student is not able to independently identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships. The student cannot give some examples of topography and clinical significance of anatomical structures. Extremely low competence level.	E	70-66		3
A student who only knows the definition of the concepts required. Some answers that show little or no understanding on the part of the student. He addresses the question, and he has something to say about general structures of human body without some details with the language or spelling errors. Threshold competence level.	E	65-61	THRESHOLD	3 (3-)
The student demonstrates an absence of both judgement and independent thinking. This is a desperation response, showing that the student read the question but doesn't know anything about the subject. This answer doesn't reveal any understanding of human anatomy. The student answers his or her own question rather than the one that was asked, answers that don't address the question. No competence developed.	Fx	60-41	ABSENT	2
Considerable further work is required	F	40-0		2

### Bonus and penalty points

Bonus points can raise the rating score of a student while penalty points decrease it. They are given according to Table 4.

Bonus points	Type of work	Points
Educational research	Educational research according to program	+ 5,0
Scientific work at the department of Outpatient and	1 <sup>st</sup> degree Diploma of the conference	+ 5,0
	2 <sup>nd</sup> degree Diploma of the conference	+ 4,0
	3 <sup>rd</sup> degree Diploma of the conference	+ 3,0
	4 <sup>th</sup> degree Diploma of the conference	+ 2,0

emergency medical care	5 <sup>th</sup> degree Diploma of the conference	+ 1,0
<b>Penalty points</b>	<b>Type of work</b>	<b>Points</b>
Disciplinary	Missing a lecture or practical session without a valid reason	- 2,0
	Systematic lateness to lectures or practical classes	- 1,0
	Safety violation	- 2,0
Material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2,0

The final grade that the teacher puts in the record book (report card) is the final rating for the discipline (Rd), translated according to the system “credited – not credited” (see Table 5)

**Table 5. Final score for the semester**

Points on 0-100 scale	Credited – not credited	Five-mark grading system		ECTS
96-100	pass	5	outstanding	A
91-95	pass	5	excellent	B
81-90	pass	4	good	C
76-80	pass	4	fair	D
61-75	pass	3	satisfactory	E
0-61	fail	2	poor	F

Considered at the meeting of the department of Outpatient and emergency medical care  
 "\_25\_" May 2023, protocol № 10

Head of the Department



Krayushkin S.I.