

**Procedure for conducting certification  
in the discipline "Physical training (elective modules)" for students  
entering in 2023, 2024, 2025  
according to the educational program 31.05.01 General Medicine,  
focus (profile) General Medicine (specialty), full-time education,  
2025-2026 academic year**

1. General principles for calculating the rating by discipline

The rating for a discipline is an individual assessment of the student's study of the discipline, which consists of the rating for the entire period of study of the discipline (preliminary rating) and the rating of the midterm assessment.

2. Calculation of preliminary rating components

2.1. General principles

The discipline is studied over six semesters (from the first to the sixth), therefore the preliminary rating for the discipline for the entire period of study ( $R_{prev}$ ) corresponds to the average semester rating of the discipline over six semesters:

$R_{prev} = (R_{sem1} + R_{sem2} + R_{sem3} + R_{sem4} + R_{sem5} + R_{sem6}) / 6$  The semester rating of the discipline is calculated using the formula:

$R_{sem} = (R_{tek} + R_{sro}) / 2 + R_b - R_{sh}$

where  $R_{tek}$  is the current rating for the discipline,

$R_{cpo}$  – rating of independent work of the student within the framework of the discipline,  $R_b$  – rating of bonuses,

$R_{sh}$  – rating of fines.

2.2. Calculating the current rating in the semester

The current rating in the semester ( $R_{tek}$ ) is calculated as the arithmetic mean of all grades received by the student during the semester of studying the discipline when completing assignments for current academic performance monitoring, which include the following types of assignments: testing physical fitness, assessment of the acquisition of practical skills (abilities).

The completion of assignments is assessed by the teacher during seminar-type classes based on the criteria presented below (Table 1) on a classic 5-point scale, where:

- 2 - unsatisfactory;
- 3 - satisfactory;
- 4 - Fine;
- 5 - Great.

Table 1

Criteria for the forms of current certification used

Task type I	Evaluation criteria And	Rating on a 5-point scale			
		5	4	3	2
Testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage correct answers</li> </ul>	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61
Interviews on control questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correctness of the answer</li> </ul>	loyal	loyal	partially true	incorrect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of the answer</li> </ul>	full	quite complete	incomplete	incomplete

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structure and the logic of the answer</li> </ul>	structured, logical	mostly structured, logical	poorly structured, the logic is broken	unstructured, fragmented, chaotic
Assessment of the acquisition of practical skills (abilities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of theoretical what are the basics execution I have skills</li> </ul>	knowledge	knowledge	shaky knowledge	lack of knowledge
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance techniques for performing the skill and success result</li> </ul>	compliance, successful outcome	compliance with minor inaccuracies, successful result	execution skill only after correction by the teacher, successful result	attempt to execute skill that does not lead to a successful result, refusal to perform a skill
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confidence and stability of execution I have skills</li> </ul>	confidence and stability	lack of confidence in stability generally	uncertainty, repetition errors during replay and skill	

At the end of the semester, Rtech is calculated and the calculated value is converted into a 100-point scale according to Table 3.

The absence of current debt is considered to be the value of Rtech more than 61 points.

### 2.3. Calculation of the rating of independent work of a student in a semester (Rsro)

The SRO rating in a semester corresponds to the student's assessment for completing the SRO electronic training course for a given discipline on the electronic information and educational portal of the Volgograd State Medical University of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation. One semester of studying a discipline includes completing one SRO electronic training course.

The SRO is assessed based on the criteria presented below (Table 2) on a classic 5-point scale, where:

- 2 - unsatisfactory;
- 3 - satisfactory;
- 4 - Fine;
- 5 - Great.

Table 2

SRO evaluation criteria

Task type	Evaluation criteria	Rating on a 5-point scale			
		5	4	3	2
SRO in the form of an	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance deadlines for completing the work</li> </ul>	observed	observed	observed	not observed

electronic course/course element on the EIOP VolgGMU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of study of material that is not subject to assessment (viewing presentations, videos)</li> </ul>	studied completely	studied completely	studied completely	not studied fully
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average score of the current tests and the final test, taking into account the weight (current 1, final 3)</li> </ul>	> 4.50	4.00 – 4.49	3.00 – 3.99	< 3.00

At the end of each study, the student's R is calculated and its calculated value is converted into a 100-point scale according to Table 3.

The absence of current debt is considered to be an Rcpo value of more than 61 points.

#### 2.4. Translation of the current rating and the SRO rating into a score on a 100-point system

At the end of the semester, the current rating and the SRO rating of the student, calculated on a 5-point system, are converted into a score on a 100-point system. The conversion is made according to Table 3.

Table 3

Translation into a rating point on a 100-point system

Averagescore on a 5-point scale system	Score out of 100-point system	Averagescore on a 5-point scale system	Score out of 100-point system	Averagescore on a 5-point scale system	Score out of 100-point system	Averagescore on a 5-point scale system	Score out of 100-point system
5.00	100	3.45	70	2.48	40	2.09	10
4.95	99	3.40	69	2.46	39	2.08	9
4.90	98	3.35	68	2.44	38	2.07	8
4.85	97	3.30	67	2.42	37	2.06	7
4.80	96	3.25	66	2.40	36	2.05	6
4.75	95	3.20	65	2.38	35	2.04	5
4.70	94	3.15	64	2.36	34	2.03	4
4.65	93	3.10	63	2.34	33	2.02	3
4.60	92	3.05	62	2.32	32	2.01	2
4.5	91	3.00	61	2.30	31	2.00	1
4.47	90	2.98	60	2.29	30		
4.43	89	2.95	59	2.28	29		
4.40	88	2.93	58	2.27	28		
4.37	87	2.90	57	2.26	27		
4.33	86	2.88	56	2.25	26		
4.30	85	2.85	55	2.24	25		
4.27	84	2.83	54	2.23	24		
4.23	83	2.80	53	2.22	23		
4.20	82	2.78	52	2.21	22		

4.17	81	2.75	51	2.20	21		
4.13	80	2.73	50	2.19	20		
4.10	79	2.70	49	2.18	19		
4.07	78	2.68	48	2.17	18		
4.03	77	2.65	47	2.16	17		
4.00	76	2.63	46	2.15	16		
3.90	75	2.60	45	2.14	15		
3.80	74	2.58	44	2.13	14		
3.70	73	2.55	43	2.12	13		
3.60	72	2.53	42	2.11	12		
3.50	71	2.50	41	2.10	11		

### 2.5. Bonus and Penalty Rating

Bonuses and penalties are set on a 100-point scale. Bonus and penalty criteria are given in Table 4.

Table 4

Bonuses and penalties for discipline

Bonuses	Name	Points
Disciplinary	100% attendance of classes	+5
Educational and research work	Publication of an article in a collection (in depending on the level of the conference)	from + 2 to + 6
	Performance on conferences (With report, With preparation of the presentation, depending on the level of the conference)	from + 5 to + 10
	Participation in the conference (without presentation)	+2
	Student research work (conducting research, report on the research)	from + 6 to + 10
	Abstract work	from + 3 to + 6
Fines	Name	Points
Disciplinary	Absence from a lecture or practical lesson without a valid reason	- 2.0
	Systematic lateness on lectures or practical classes	- 1.0
	Failure to complete research within the established deadlines	- 1.0
	Violation of safety regulations	- 2.0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2.0

### 3. Calculation of the midterm assessment rating

The midterm assessment for the discipline is carried out in the form of a test and includes

an interview on control questions. The assessment of the level of formation of the necessary competencies in the student is carried out on a 100-point scale according to the criteria of Table 5.

Table 5

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

Characteristics of the answer	ECTS assessment	Points in BRS	Level of development competencies in the discipline
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, a set of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, manifested in free operation of concepts, the ability to identify its essential and non-essential features, cause-and-effect relationships. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is formulated in scientific terms, presented in literary language, logical, convincing, demonstrates the author's position of the student. Student demonstrates high level of competence development. Intermediate assessment passed.	A	100-96	HIGH
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the totality of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, the main provisions of the topic are convincingly disclosed; a clear structure, logical sequence, reflecting the essence of the concepts, theories, and phenomena being disclosed is traced in the answer. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of its understanding in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is presented in literary language in scientific terms. There may be shortcomings in the definition of concepts, corrected for students independently in the process of answering. The student demonstrates a high level of competence development. Interim assessment passed.	B	95-91	
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential features, cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is clearly structured, logical, presented in literary language in scientific terms. There may be shortcomings or minor mistakes, corrected learners with the help of a teacher. Learner demonstrates average level of formation competence. Interim assessment passed.	C	90-81	AVERAGE
A full, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential features, cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented in scientific terms. However, minor errors or shortcomings were made, corrected by the student with the help of "leading" questions teacher. The student demonstrates an average sufficient level of competence development. The midterm assessment has been passed.	D	80-76	

A complete but insufficiently consistent answer to the question is given, but the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is logical and presented in scientific terms. There may be 1-2 errors in defining the basic concepts that the student has difficulty to correct independently. The student demonstrates low level formation competence. Interim assessment passed.	E	75-71	SHORT
The answer is not complete or detailed enough. The logic and sequence of presentation are flawed. Errors were made in the disclosure of concepts and the use of terms. The student is unable to independently identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships. The student may be to specify generalized knowledge, proving their main provisions using examples only with the help of a teacher. Speech design requires corrections. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence development. Interim assessment passed.	E	70-66	
An incomplete answer is given, the logic and sequence of presentation have significant violations. Gross errors were made in determining the essence of the concepts, theories, phenomena being revealed, due to the student's lack of understanding of their essential and non-essential features and connections. The answer lacks conclusions. The ability to reveal specific manifestations of generalized knowledge is not demonstrated. Speech design requires amendments, correction. The student demonstrates threshold level formation of competencies. Interim certification passed.	E	65-61	THRESHOLD
An incomplete answer is given, representing fragmentary knowledge on the topic of the question with significant errors in definitions. Fragmentation and illogical presentation are present. The student does not understand the connection between this concept, theory, phenomenon and other objects of the discipline. There are no conclusions, specification and evidence of the presentation. Speech is illiterate. Additional and clarifying questions from 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 absent. Intermediate certification failed.	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE LACKS
No answers were received to the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators achievements formations competencies. Competence is absent. The midterm assessment was not passed.	F	40-0	

#### 4. Calculation of the final rating for the discipline

The final grade for the discipline ( $R_d$ ) is calculated using the formula:

$$R_d = (R_{prev} + R_{pa}) / 2$$

The final score, calculated on a 100-point scale, is converted into point system according to table 6.

5-

Table 6.  
Final grade for the discipline

Rating on a 100-point scale	Rating on a 5-point scale		ECTS assessment
96-100	5	Great	A
91-95			B
81-90	4	Fine	C
76-80			D
61-75	3	satisfactorily	E
41-60	2	unsatisfactory	Fx
0-40			F

Considered at the meeting of the Department of Physical Education and Health on May 30, 2025. Minutes No. 18.

Head of Department



S.Yu.Maximova