

**Порядок проведения аттестации  
по дисциплине «Общественное здоровье и здравоохранение,  
экономика здравоохранения»  
для обучающихся по образовательной программе  
специалитета по специальности 31.05.01 Лечебное дело,  
направленность (профиль) Лечебное дело,  
форма обучения очная,  
на 2024- 2025 учебный год**

**PROCEDURE FOR CARRYING OUT THE CURRENT AND  
INTERMEDIATE CERTIFICATION IN THE DISCIPLINE**

The procedure for conducting certification in the discipline "Public Health and Healthcare, Health Economics" for students in the educational program of a specialist in the specialty 31.05.01 General Medicine (hereinafter referred to as the Procedure) was developed on the basis of the "Regulations on the scoring system for assessing the progress of students in the Federal State Budgetary Educational institution of higher education "Volgograd State Medical University" of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation " (order on entry into force No. 1034-KO dated June 19, 2024).

The current attestation in the discipline "Public health and healthcare, health economics is carried out for 3rd, 4th and 6th year students of the Faculty of Medicine during 6, 7 and 12 semesters. Intermediate certification is carried out in the 12th semester in the form of an exam (33 hours to prepare for the exam).

The assessment of the level of preparation of students during the certification in the discipline is carried out on the basis of determining the student's rating according to the system of bonuses and penalties, based on the calculation of the current rating by the average score.

1. Methodology for calculating the final rating of mastering the discipline ( $R_d$ )

The final rating of mastering the discipline ( $R_d$ ) is calculated by the teacher of a group of students at the end of the examination session.

Discipline ranking (final,  $R_d$ ) is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_d = (R_{adr} + R_{ic}) / 2,$$

$R_d$  – discipline ranking;

$R_{ic}$  – intermediate certification ranking (exam);

$R_{adr}$  – average discipline rating for the seventh and twelfth semester - individual assessment of the acquired knowledge in the educational discipline (in points for two semesters of study).

The average discipline rating for 3 semesters of study is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_{adr} = (R_{pr6} + R_{pr7} + R_{pr12} + R_{test}) / 4,$$

$R_{pr6}$  – preliminary ranking by discipline in the 6th semester;

$R_{pr7}$  – preliminary ranking by discipline in the 7th semester;

$R_{pr12}$  – preliminary ranking by discipline in the 12th semester.

$R_{test}$  – ranking for the final test in the twelfth semester.

The preliminary ranking for the discipline in the 6th, 7th and 12th semesters ( $R_{pr}$ ) is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_{pr} = R_{cur} + R_b - R_f,$$

$R_{cur}$  – current rating for the seventh or twelfth semester;

$R_b$  – bonus rating;

$R_f$  – rating of forfeit.

The maximum number of points that a student in the discipline can receive in the semester is 100. The minimum number of points at which the discipline should be counted is 61.

## 2. Methodology for calculating the average score of current academic performance in in the 6th, 7th and 12th semesters ( $R_{pr6}$ , $R_{pr7}$ , $R_{pr12}$ )

The knowledge and work of the student in seminar-type classes held during the semester, as well as the fulfillment of tasks for independent work, are evaluated by the teacher on a 5-point scale.

Independent work of students includes independent study of individual topics provided for by the work program. Each topic of independent work is evaluated from 0 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

Evaluation criteria	Rating score
The work is not commissioned, not fully commissioned, the work does not correspond to the topic of independent work.	0-2
The work was completed in full, but it made more than 2 gross thematic errors or missed more than the 1st key issue of the topic of independent work.	3
The work was completed in full, but it made 1- 2 gross thematic errors or missed 1 key issue of the topic of independent work.	4
The work was completed in full, there are no gross thematic errors in it, the key issues of the topic of independent work are not missed.	5

Assignments for lectures are evaluated by the values "Passed" or "Not passed". For each task with an assessment of "Not passed" or an unfulfilled task, a student is charged a penalty of -2 points. The amount of penalty points ( $R_f$ ) is determined after the date of completion of training in the semester and reduces the rating of the current performance ( $R_{cur}$ ).

Each task of seminar-type classes, with the exception of tasks of boundary control of knowledge, is evaluated with a score from 0 to 5 in accordance with Table 1. An assignment not completed before the time set by the teacher is evaluated with a score of "0". In order to increase the grade, it is allowed to repeat the task by the student in the period up to the date of completion of training in the corresponding semester, indicated in the semester schedule. Tasks for the classes of boundary control of knowledge are mandatory for students to complete. A boundary control task rated below 3 points is not counted and must be repeated until a score of 3 or higher is obtained.

At the end of each semester, the average score is calculated on a 5-point scale, which is translated into the current performance rating ( $R_{cur}$ ) on a 100-point system (Table 2).

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

Average score on a 5-point system	Score on 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system <small>системе</small>	Score on 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	100-point system score
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 points for the final testing in the 12th semester ( $R_{test}$ )

The minimum number of points that can be obtained during testing is 61, the maximum is 100 points.

For a correctly executed task, the tested person receives 1 (one) point, for an incorrectly executed task - 0 (zero) points. Evaluation of the results after passing the test is carried out in accordance with Table 3.

Table 3. Translation of the test result into a rating score on a 100-point system

Number of errors made when responding to 100 test tasks	Percentage of Test Jobs Completed	Rating score on a 100-point system
0 - 9	91-100	91-100
10 - 19	81-90	81-90
20 - 29	71-80	71-80
30 - 39	61-70	61-70
$\geq 40$	0-60	0

The final test is considered to be performed at 61 or higher. If you receive less than 61 points - you need to undergo testing again.

### 3. Intermediate Certification Score Calculation Methodology (Exam) ( $R_{ic}$ )

Intermediate certification in the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam. The exam takes place in 2 stages: solving situational problems on a computer and interviews.

At the stage of solving situational tasks, the examinee is given 5 calculation tasks by the method of random selection with an assessment of the formation of the practical component of the formed competencies, for the solution of which 30 minutes are allotted. Each correctly completed task is worth 20 points. The maximum number of points for 1 stage is 100 points.

The interview includes 3 questions of the examination ticket, which relate to different sections of the discipline. The maximum number of points for stage 2 is 100 points. The assessment of the interview stage is determined in accordance with table 4.

The intermediate certification rating ( $R_{ic}$ ) is determined as the arithmetic average of two stages of the intermediate certification. To successfully pass the certification, a student must receive 61 points or more, the maximum is 100 points (Table 4).

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

Response characteristics	Assessment ECTS	100-point rating	Discipline Competency Level	Score on a 5-point scale
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, a set of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, manifested in free operation with concepts, the ability to identify significant and insignificant its signs, cause and effect relationships. Knowledge of the object demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is formulated in terms of science, set forth 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 evidentially disclosed; the answer traces a clear structure, logical sequence, reflecting the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, phenomena. Knowledge of the object is demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is set forth in literary language in terms of science. Shortcomings in the definition of concepts may be made, corrected by the student independently during the response process. The student demonstrates a high level of competence formation.	B	95–91		5
A complete, detailed answer to the question was given, the ability to identify significant and insignificant signs, cause and effect relationships was shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, set forth in literary language in terms of science. Defects or minor errors may be made, corrected by training with the help of a teacher. The student demonstrates an average increased level of competence formation.	C	90–81	AVERAGE	4

A complete, detailed answer to the question was given, the ability to identify significant and insignificant signs, cause and effect relationships was shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, set out in terms of science. However, minor mistakes or shortcomings were made, corrected by the student with the help of "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 posed, but the ability to identify significant and insignificant signs and causal relationships is shown. The answer is logical and set out in terms of science. 1-2 errors may be made in the definition of basic concepts that the student finds difficult to correct on his own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence formation.	E	75-71	LOW	3 (3+)
An insufficiently complete and insufficiently expanded response was given. 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 significant and insignificant signs and causal relationships. The student can concretize the generalized knowledge by proving their basic provisions using examples only with the help of the teacher. Speech design requires corrections, correction.  The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence formation.	E	70-66		3
The given incomplete answer, logic and sequence of presentation have significant violations. Gross errors were made in determining the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, phenomena, due to a misunderstanding by students of their significant and insignificant signs and connections. There are no conclusions in the response. The ability to reveal specific manifestations of generalized knowledge is not shown. Speech design requires corrections, correction.  The student demonstrates the threshold level of competency formation.	E	65-61	THRESHOLD	3 (3-)
An incomplete answer is given, which is a disparate knowledge on the topic of a question with significant errors in definitions. Fragmentation, illogical presentation are present. The student is not aware of the connection of this concept, theory, phenomenon with other objects of the discipline. There are no conclusions, specificity and evidence of presentation. The 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. There is no competence.	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE IS ABSENT	2
No answers were received on basic discipline issues. The student does not demonstrate indicators of achievement of competency formation. Lack of competence.	F	40-0		2

#### 4. Bonus and Forfeit

This rating model provides for bonuses that increase the rating score and forfeit that reduce the rating according to the table below (Table 5).

Table 5. Discipline Bonuses and Forfeit

Accrual type	Name	Points
<b>Bonuses (<math>R_b</math>)</b>		
Organizational	Additional organizational work and assistance to the teacher in conducting classes using distance learning technologies	up to + 2.0
Scientific work	Participation in the performance of scientific work in the youth scientific society of the department	up to + 3.0
<b>Forfeit (<math>R_f</math>)</b>		
Disciplinary	A pass without a valid reason for a lecture or practical class	- 4.0
Disciplinary	Non-fulfillment of tasks for a lecture, practical lesson or independent work	- 2.0
Damage to property	Damage to equipment and property	- 2.0

The final grade that the teacher puts in the test book is the rating by discipline final ( $R_d$ ), translated into a 5-point system (Table 6).

Table 6. Final Discipline Grade

100-point system grade	Rating according to the system "counted - not counted"	Grade on a 5-point system		ECTS Grade
96-100	done	5	excellent	A
91-95	done			B
81-90	done	4	well	C
76-80	done			D
61-75	done	3	satisfactory	E
41-60	not done	2	unsatisfactory	Fx
0-40	not done			F

Рассмотрено на заседании кафедры общественного здоровья и здравоохранения 18.06.2024 протокол № 13.

Заведующий кафедрой



В.Л. Аджиенко