Attestation procedure
in practice "PRACTICAL TRAINING IN EMERGENCY MEDICAL PROCEDURES"
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

Rp – final rating score for the practice «Practical training in emergency medical procedures» is calculated from rating scores for 6_{th} semester and rating score for the credit with grade, where the maximum score is 100 and the minimum passing score is 61.

Rp is calculated according to the formula:
$$Rp = (Rmp+Ri)/2,$$
where
Rmp – mean preliminary rating score is the rating score for 6th semester prior to the credit.
Ri - mean rating score for the intermediate attestation (credit)

Preliminary rating score for the 6th semester is calculated as follows:
$$Rmp = R_c + bonus\ points – penalty\ points$$

where:

R_c – current rating in the 6th semester calculated as the arithmetic mean for all the rating points gained during the practice, including assessment of mastering for practical abilities (skills) (working on simulators) and the independent work. Independent work of students includes work with a physician or a physician's assistant in the emergency medical services (of an operating ambulance team) and/or at the urgency medical care departments in polyclinics.

The form of the independent work is a diary of practical training according to individual task.

Calculation algorithm

1. Methodology for calculating the average score of current academic performance (Rtec)

At each stage of the practice (work on mannequins / simulators, work with a physician or a physician's assistant in the emergency medical services (of an operating ambulance team) and/or at the urgency medical care departments in polyclinics, registration of medical documentation of a doctor of emergency medical care (call cards, signal sheet, algorithm for emergency medical care), the student performs practical tasks according to individual plan. According to the results of the practical tasks of the practice, the student is assessed on a 5-point scale for each stage. The arithmetic mean is calculated from these marks, which is then translated into a 100-point scale (Table 1). The minimum score is 61.

Table 1. Transfer of the average score of the student's current academic performance to a rating score according to a 100-point system

Average score on the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	Average score on the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	Average score on the 5-point system	Score according to the 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		

Calculating rating score for practice (Rp):

The intermediate attestation is performed as a credit with grade.

The interim certification includes the protection of accounting documents (a practice diary based on the results of an individual task), an interview with an assessment of the formation of the practical component of the competencies being formed on control issues.

As part of the interim certification, the following are evaluated:

a) *The quality of the student's report document (practice diary).*

The submitted document is evaluated by the teacher in accordance with the criteria (see table 2). The minimum score is 61.

Table 2. Criteria for evaluating the student's reporting documents on practice

Evaluation criteria	Rating score
The diary based on the results of the individual task has not been submitted.	0
The diary has not been completed; there are errors of content and design.	1-20
The diary has not been completed in full, the work does not correspond to the subject of independent work	21-40
The diary was completed in full, but it made more than 2-3 gross thematic errors	41-60
The diary was completed in full, but it made 1-2 thematic errors	61-80
The diary has been completed in full, there are no gross thematic errors in it, key questions have not been missed	81-100

b) *Assessment of the development of practical skills* (the level of the formed practical component of the formed competencies).

The assessment is made according to the criteria presented in Table 3. The minimum score is 61.

Table 3. Criteria for evaluating the results of mastering practical skills

Evaluation criteria	Rating score
The diary based on the results of the individual task has not been submitted.	0
The diary has not been completed; there are errors of content and design.	1-20
The diary has not been completed in full, the work does not correspond to the subject of independent work	21-40
The diary was completed in full, but it made more than 2-3 gross thematic errors	41-60
The diary was completed in full, but it made 1-2 thematic errors	61-80
The diary has been completed in full, there are no gross thematic errors in it, key questions have not been missed	81-100

c) *interview on control issues.*
The assessment is carried out according to the criteria presented in Table 4.

Table 4. 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 to demonstrate his/her understanding of the definition using some anatomical models and organs. Medium sufficient competence level.	D	80-76		4 (4-)
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	E	75-71	LOW	3 (3+)

those names to the correct clinical significance with some errors. Low competence level.				
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 5.

Bonus points	**Type of work**	**Points**
Educational research	Educational research according to program	+ 5,0
Scientific work at the department of Outpatient and emergency medical care	1st degree Diploma of the conference	+ 5,0
	2nd degree Diploma of the conference	+ 4,0
	3rd degree Diploma of the conference	+ 3,0
	4th degree Diploma of the conference	+ 2,0
	5th degree Diploma of the conference	+ 1,0
Penalty points	**Type of work**	**Points**
Disciplinary	Missing a practical session without a valid reason	- 2,0
	Systematic lateness to practical training	- 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 practice (Rp), translated according to the five-mark grading system (see Table 6).

Table 6. Final score for the semester

Points on 0-100 scale	Pass/fail	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.