

**Procedure for conducting an assessment
in the discipline "Physiology"
for students of the 2025 year of admission
of the educational program Pharmacy Specialist
in the specialty 33.05.01 Pharmacy
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 discipline is studied during the 2nd and 3^d semesters.

A rating is calculated in each semester.

The preliminary rating for the entire study period (R_{prel}) corresponds to the average semester rating for the discipline in the second and third semesters

$$R_{prel} = (R_{sem2} + R_{sem3}) / 2$$

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

$$R_{sem} = (R_{cur} + R_{siw}) / 2 + R_b - R_p$$

where R_{cur} – is the current rating for the discipline,

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

R_b – is the rating of bonuses, and

R_p – is the rating of penalties.

2.2. Calculating the current rating in the semester

The current semester rating (R_{cur}) is calculated as the arithmetic mean of all the grades received by the student during the semester of studying the discipline when completing the current control assignments, which include the following types of assignments: testing, solving situational tasks, a control work, an interview on control questions, and an assessment of the development of practical skills (abilities).

The assignments are evaluated by the teacher at each seminar-type class based on the criteria presented below (Table 1) using a classical 5-point scale, where:

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

Criteria for the current certification forms used

Table 1

Task type	Evaluation criteria	Grade on a 5-point scale			
		5	4	3	2
Testing	• Percentage of correct answers	91-100	76-90	61-75	< 61
Situational task solving	• Correctness of the received answer	correct	correct	partially correct	incorrect

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability, completeness, and correctness of the justification for the received answer 	reasoned without comments	reasoned with comments	partially	no justification provided
Control work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctness of the received answers 	correct	correct	substantiated	incorrect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability, completeness, and correctness of the justification for the received answers 	reasoned without comments	reasoned with comments	partially correct	-
Interview on control questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correctness of the answer 	correct	correct	partially substantiated	incorrect
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completeness of the answer 	complete	sufficiently complete	partially correct	incomplete
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structure and logic of the answer 	structured, logical	mostly structured and logical	incomplete	unstructured, fragmented, chaotic
Assessment of the development of practical skills (abilities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of the theoretical basis for performing the skill 	knowledge	knowledge	poorly structured, logic is broken	lack of knowledge
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the technique for performing the skill and the success of the result 	compliance, successful result	compliance with minor inaccuracies, successful result	unstable knowledge performing the skill only after the teacher corrects it, successful result	attempting to perform a skill without achieving a successful result, or refusing to perform the skill
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confidence and stability in performing the skill 	confidence and stability	lack of confidence with overall stability	uncertainty, repeating mistakes when repeating the skill	

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

A value of Rcur greater than 61 points is considered to be in the absence of current debt.

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

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

SIWs are evaluated based on the criteria presented below (Table 2) using a classic 5-point scale, where:

2 – unsatisfactory;

3 – satisfactory;

4 – good;

5 – excellent.

SIW assessment criteria

Table 2

Task type	Evaluation	Grade on a 5-point scale
-----------	------------	--------------------------

	criteria	5	4	3	2
SIW in the form of an electronic course on the EIEP of VolgSMU	• Compliance with the deadlines for completing the work	have been complied with	have been complied with	have been complied with	have not been complied with
	• Completeness of studying the material that is not subject to evaluation (viewing presentations and videos)	fully completed	fully completed	fully completed	Partially completed
	• Completion of the tasks in the evaluation sections of the EEC and the control section	> 4,50	4,00 – 4,49	3,00 – 3,99	< 3,00

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

A value of Rsiw greater than 61 points is considered to be in the absence of current debt.

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

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

Conversion into a rating score using a 100-point system

Table 3

Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 100-point system	Average score on a 5-point system	Score on a 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 awarded according to a 100-point system. The criteria for bonuses and penalties are listed in Table 4.

Table 4
Bonuses and penalties by discipline

Bonuses	Name	Points
ERWS	Educational and research work on the topics of the subject being studied	up to + 5,0
SRWS	Certificate, diploma, etc. of the department's participant of the student scientific society	up to + 5,0
Penalty	Name	Points
Disciplinary	Absent a lecture or practical class without a good reason	- 2,0
	Failure to complete assignments in practice classes	- 2,0
	Systematic lateness to lectures or practical classes	- 1,0
	Safety violation	- 2,0
Causing material damage	Damage to equipment and property	- 2,0

3. Calculation of the intermediate attestation rating

Intermediate certification in the discipline is carried out in the form of an exam.

The exam takes place in the form of an interview with an assessment of the formation of the practical component of the formed competencies, which includes questions on all studied

sections of the program. The minimum number of points (Ria) that can be obtained during the interview is 61, the maximum is 100 points.

The level of development of the necessary competencies is assessed on a 100-point scale using the criteria in Table 5.

Table 5
Criteria for assessing the level of mastery of discipline material and the development of competencies

Characteristics of the answer	Grade ECTS	Points in BRS	Level of competence development in the discipline	Grade on a 5-point system
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, the totality of conscious knowledge about an object is shown, manifested in the free operation of concepts, the ability to identify its essential and non-essential features, and 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. The answer is formulated in scientific terms, presented in literary language, logical, demonstrative, and demonstrates the student's author's position. The student demonstrates a high advanced level of competence development	A	100–96		5 (5+)
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 conclusively revealed; the answer shows a clear structure, a logical sequence that reflects the essence of the concepts, theories, and phenomena being revealed. Knowledge about an object is demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of a given science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is stated in literary language in scientific terms. There may be shortcomings in the definition of concepts, which are corrected by the student independently during the answering process. The student demonstrates a high level of competence development	B	95–91	HIGH	5
A complete, detailed answer to the question posed is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented in literary terms in scientific terms. There may be shortcomings or minor mistakes, corrected by the student with the help of the teacher. The student demonstrates an	C	90–81	AVERAGE	4

average high level of competence development.				
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and stated in scientific terms. However, minor mistakes, or omissions 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.	D	80-76	4 (4-)	
A complete, but insufficiently consistent answer to the question posed is given, but at the same time the ability to identify essential and non-essential features and cause-and-effect relationships is demonstrated. The answer is logical and stated in scientific terms. There may be 1-2 mistakes made in defining basic concepts, which the student finds difficult to correct on his own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence development.	E	75-71	3 (3+)	
The answer given is insufficiently complete and insufficiently detailed. The logic and consistency of presentation have violations. Mistakes 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 by proving its main points with examples only with the help of the teacher. Speech design requires amendments and corrections. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence development	E	70-66	3	LOW
An incomplete answer was given; the logic and sequence of presentation have significant violations. Gross mistakes were made in determining the essence of the concepts, theories, and phenomena being revealed, due to the student's lack of understanding of their essential and non-essential features and connections. The answer contains no conclusions. The ability to reveal specific manifestations of generalized knowledge is not shown. Speech design requires amendments and corrections. The student demonstrates a threshold level of competence development	E	65-61	3 (3-)	THRESHOLD

An incomplete answer was given, representing scattered knowledge on the topic of the question with significant errors in definitions. There is fragmentation and illogical presentation. The student does not realize the connection of this concept, theory, phenomenon with other objects of the discipline. There are no conclusions, specificity and evidence of the presentation. Speech is illiterate. Additional and clarifying questions from the teacher do not lead to correction of the student's answer not only to the question posed, but also to other questions in the discipline. No competence.	Fx	60-41	COMPETENCE ABSENT	2
Answers on basic questions of the discipline have not been received. The student does not demonstrate indicators of achieving the formation of competencies. No competence.	F	40-0		2

4. Calculation of the final rating for the discipline

The final grade for the discipline (R) is calculated using the following formula:

$$Rd = (R_{prel} + R_{ia}) / 2$$

The final grade calculated in the 100-point system is converted to a 5-point system according to Table 6.

Final grade for the discipline

Table 6

Grade on a 100-point system	Grade according to the pass/fail system	Grade on a 5-point system		Grade on ECTS
96-100	passed	5	excellent	A
91-95	passed			B
81-90	passed	4	good	C
76-80	passed			D
61-75	passed	3	satisfactory	E
41-60	not passed	2	unsatisfactory	Fx
0-40	not passed			F

Considered at the meeting of the department of Normal physiology "20" May 2025,
protocol N 10

Head of the Department



S. V. Klauchek