

**Procedure for conducting attestation
in discipline "Ophthalmology"
for students of of 2022 year of admission
under the educational program specialist
in the specialty 31.05.01 General medicine,
direction (profile) General medicine,
form of study Full-time
for the 2025–2026 academic year**

1. General principles for calculating the rating in the 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 intermediate attestation.

2. Calculation of preliminary rating components

2.1. General principles

The final rating for the discipline (R_d) is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_d = (R_p + R_{ia}) / 2 \text{ where:}$$

R_d - rating for a discipline

R_p - preliminary rating

R_{ia} - rating of the intermediate attestation

The discipline is studied during one semester (eighth), therefore the preliminary rating for the discipline for the entire period of study (R_p) corresponds to the semester rating of the disciplines in the eighth semester (R_{sem}):

$$R_p = R_{sem}$$

The semester rating of a discipline is calculated using the formula:

$$R_{sem} = (R_{current} + R_{iw}) / 2 + R_b - R_{pr}$$

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

R_{iw} is the rating of the student's independent work within the discipline,

R_b is the bonus rating,

R_{pr} is the penalty rating.

The maximum number of points a student can receive for a course is 100. The minimum number of points for which the course must be passed is 61.

2.2 Calculating the current rating in the semester

The current rating in the semester ($R_{current}$) is calculated as the arithmetic mean of all grades received by the student during the semester of studying the discipline when completing assignments of current academic performance monitoring, which include the following types of assignments: testing, solving situational problems, assessing the acquisition of practical skills (abilities), writing and defending an essay, interviewing on test questions.

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

2 - unsatisfactory; 3 - satisfactory; 4 - good; 5 - excellent.

Table 1 Criteria for the forms of current certification used

| Task type | Assessment criteria | 5-point scale | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Testing | □ % of true answers | 91-100 | 76-90 | 61-75 | < 61 |
| Case study | Correctness of the answer received: | correct | correct | correct partially | incorrect |
| | Availability, completeness and correctness of the justification for the response | received justified without comments | justified with comments | partially justified | justification absent |
| Interview on control questions | Correctness of the answer received: | correct | correct | correct partially | incorrect |
| | Completeness of the answer | complete | complete sufficiently | incomplete | incomplete |
| | Structure and logic of the answer | structured, logical | mostly structured, logical | poorly structured, logic is broken | unstructured, fragmented, chaotic |
| Writing and defending an abstract, preparing a report | 1. Technical assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with the performance regulations • Compliance with the requirements for the elements of the performance 2. Content assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of structure and logic of the report • Presence of links and transitions between parts of the report • Disclosure of the topic in the report 3. Aesthetic assessment (assessment of oratory skills) (if required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speech rate • Speech volume • Use of appropriate style and vocabulary 4. 1. Evaluation of the non-verbal component of the report (if required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manner of holding yourself in front of the audience • Use of gestures, facial expressions and pantomime to support verbal information 5. Evaluation of a group report (if required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution of parts of the report between speakers by time and content • Taking into account the individual characteristics of the speakers when distributing parts of the report between speakers 6. Answers to questions following the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychological readiness to answer • Correctness of the argumentation of the answers • Manner of holding oneself 7. Additionally – asking questions to the speaker by other students (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is aimed at obtaining information that was not explicitly reflected in the report • The question is not aimed at identifying information known to the student The question shows that the student is analyzing the speaker's information | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|-------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Skills | • Knowledge of the theoretical foundations of performing a skill | knowledge | knowledge | knowledge is not formed | lack of knowledge |
| | • Compliance with the technique of performing the skill and the success of the result compliance, compliance with minor inaccuracies, | successful result | successful result after correction by the teacher | refusal to perform the skill | refusal to perform the skill |

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

The IW rating in a semester corresponds to the student's assessment for completing the IW 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 IW electronic training course.

IW assessment is carried out based on the criteria presented below (table 2) on a classic 5-point scale, where: 2 - unsatisfactory; 3 - satisfactory; 4 - good; 5 - excellent.

Table 2 IW rating evaluation criteria

| Task type | Assessment criteria | 5-point scale | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| SRO in the form of an electronic course at the EIOP VolGMU | Compliance with deadlines for work completion | observed | observed | observed | not observed |
| | Completeness of study of material that is not subject to assessment (viewing presentations, videos) | studied completely | studied completely | studied completely | not fully studied |
| | Completion of tasks of the evaluation parts of the EUC and the control section | > 4,50 | 4,00 – 4,49 | 3,00 – 3,99 | < 3,00 |

2.4. Conversion of the current rating and the independent student's work rating into a score on a 100-point system

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

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

Converting the current rating and IW rating to a score on a 100-point system

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

Table 3

Translation into rating points on a 100-point system

| 5-point system | 100-point system | 5-point system | 100-point system | 5-point system | 100-point system | 5-point system | 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.

| Type of bonus | Points |
|---|--------|
| Educational and research work on the topics of the subject being studied Certificate, diploma, etc. of the participant | + 5,0 |
| Type of Penalty | Points |
| Missing a lecture or practical lesson without reason | - 2,0 |
| Failure to complete assignments during practical classes | - 2,0 |
| Systematic lateness to lectures or practical classes | - 1,0 |
| Violation of safety regulations | - 2,0 |
| Damage to equipment and property | - 2,0 |

3. Calculation of the intermediate attestation rating (R_{ia})

Intermediate assessment in the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam. The exam is conducted in the form of an interview with an assessment of the formation of the practical component of the competencies being formed, including questions on all studied sections of the program and the solution of a situational problem. 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 the formation of competencies

| Characteristics of the answer | Points ECTS | Points | Level of development of competence in the discipline |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------|--|
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--------|--------|
| A full, 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 its understanding in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. | A | 100-96 | HIGH |
| The answer is formulated in scientific terms, presented in literary language, logical, evidence-based, demonstrates the author's position of the student. The student demonstrates a high advanced level of competence formation. Intermediate attestation is passed. | | | |
| 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; the answer shows a clear structure, logical sequence, reflecting the essence of the concepts, theories, phenomena being disclosed. 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 by the student independently in the process of answering. The student demonstrates a high level of competence development. Intermediate attestation assessment passed. | B | 95-91 | MIDDLE |
| 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, presented in literary language in scientific terms. There may be shortcomings or minor errors corrected by the student with the help of the teacher. The student demonstrates an average advanced level of competence development. Intermediate attestation passed. | C | 90-81 | |
| 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, which were corrected by the student with the help of the teacher's "leading" questions. The student demonstrates an average sufficient level of competence development. Intermediate attestation 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 basic concepts that the student finds difficult to correct independently. The student demonstrates a low level of competence development. Intermediate attestation passed. | E | 75-71 | LOW |
| The answer is not complete or detailed enough. The logic and sequence of presentation are violated. Errors were made in the disclosure of concepts and 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 its main provisions using examples only with the help of the teacher. Speech design requires amendments, correction. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence development. Intermediate attestation passed. | E | 70-66 | |
| The answer is incomplete, 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 misunderstanding 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 a threshold level of competence development. Intermediate attestation passed. | E | 65-61 | MARGIN |
| . 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 of this concept, theory, phenomenon with 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 attestation has not been passed | Fx | 60-41 | LACK OF COMPETENCE |

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| No answers were received to the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators of achievement of the formation of competencies. Competence is absent. Intermediate attestation has not been passed. | F | 40-0 |
|---|---|------|

4. Calculation of the final rating for the discipline

The final rating for the discipline (R_d) is calculated using the following formula:

$$R_d = (R_p + R_{ia}) / 2$$

The final score, calculated on a 100-point scale, is converted into a 5-point scale according to Table 6.

Table 6.

Final grade for the discipline

| 100-point system | 5-point system | Result | ECTS |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|------|
| 96-100 | 5 | excellent | A |
| 91-95 | | | B |
| 81-90 | 4 | good | C |
| 76-80 | | | D |
| 61-75 | 3 | satisfactory | E |
| 41-60 | 2 | unsatisfactory | Fx |
| 0-40 | | | F |

Considered at the Biology department meeting, protocol of «06» June 2025 г. № 14

-
Head of the Department

I.A.Gndoyan