

The procedure for certification in the discipline "Pediatrics" for students enrolled in 2020 according to the educational program 30.05.03 "Dentistry", orientation (profile) Dentistry is a full-time form of study The 2024-2025 academic year.

The final Rd – rating for the discipline is an individual cumulative assessment of the assimilation of the discipline in points, taking into account the intermediate certification, the maximum number of points is 100, the minimum number of points at which the discipline can be credited is 61.

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

$$\mathbf{Rd} = (\mathbf{Rpredv} + \mathbf{Rspets_theor} + \mathbf{Rspets_pn} + \mathbf{Rpa}) / 2$$

where **Rd** is the rating for the discipline

Rpredv– the average rating of the discipline per semester of study – an individual assessment of the assimilation of the discipline in points per semester of study.

Rspets_theor - rating of theoretical knowledge control

Rspets_pn — rating of practical skills control

Rpa is the rating of the intermediate certification (credit).

The average rating of the discipline (RPA) is calculated using the following formula:

$$\mathbf{Rpa} = (\mathbf{Rcem} + \mathbf{Rcro}) / 2 + \mathbf{Rb} - \mathbf{Rsh}$$

where: **Rpredv** – the average rating of the discipline per semester of study – an individual assessment of the assimilation of the discipline in points per semester of study.

Rcem is the average rating of the discipline for the semester during the classroom work (current academic performance, which is assessed according to the average score, without taking into account the independent work of students)

Rcro — the average rating for a semester in the course of independent work of students

Rb – bonus rating

Rsh – penalty rating

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

Calculation algorithm

1. The method of calculating the average score of current academic performance.

The rating score for the discipline in the semester (Rtsem) is estimated in total, taking into account the current academic performance, which is assessed according to the average score without taking into account the grades for independent work of students. The knowledge and work of the student in practical classes are evaluated by the teacher according to the classical 5-point system. At the end of the semester, a centralized calculation of the average student's academic performance in the semester is performed with its transfer to a 100-point system.

The rating score of students' independent work (Rcro) is also evaluated in total according to the average score of the SRO. Independent work includes independent study of 2 separate topics provided for in the work program. The form of the independent work report is a presentation using at least 4 sources of recommended literature and Internet resources. Each topic of independent work is evaluated according to a 5-point system, work rated below 3 points is not counted and requires completion by students. Then the average score of the SRO is calculated, followed by its transfer to a 100-point system. The theoretical knowledge and practical skills of the student are evaluated during an oral survey using the FOS, also according to the classical 5-point system, followed by transfer to a 100-point system, while the level of theoretical knowledge and the formation of practical a component of the competencies being formed.

Table 1. Criteria for the generalized assessment of the student's independent work

Type of task	Evaluation criteria
SRO in the form of a presentation	1. Technical assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting deadlines for the completion of work • Compliance with registration requirements 2. Content assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content relevance to the topic • The fact of disclosure of the topic • Reflection of all necessary elements of the task in the work • Availability of structure and logic of work • Matching the style of the text to the type of work 3. Evaluation of the student's analytical work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of the choice of sources • Level of analysis (deep/superficial) Analytical tools and presentation of conclusions (including the use of diagrams, examples, illustrations, graphs, etc.)
SRO in the form of an abstract	1. Technical assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with the performance rules • Compliance with the requirements for performance elements 2. Assessment of the content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of the structure and logic of the report • The presence of links and transitions between parts of the report • Disclosure of the topic in the report 3. Aesthetic assessment (assessment of public speaking skills) (if required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speech tempo • Speech volume • The use of appropriate stylistics and vocabulary 4. Evaluation of the non-verbal component of the report (if required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demeanor in front of an audience • Using gestures, facial expressions and pantomimes to support verbal information 5. Evaluation of the group report (if required): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution of parts of the report among the speakers by time and content • Taking into account the individual characteristics of the speakers when distributing parts of the report among the speakers 6. Answers to questions based on the results of the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychological readiness to respond • Correctness of the argumentation of the answers • Demeanor 7. Additionally, other students pose questions to the speaker (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 students • The question shows that the student analyzes the speaker's information

Table 2. Assessment for students' independent work on a 5-point scale

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

Table 3. Conversion of the average score of the student's current academic performance into a rating score according to a 100-point system

The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 100-point system	The average score according to the 5-point system	Score according to the 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. The method of calculating the intermediate certification score (credit) (Kpa):

The intermediate certification in the discipline is carried out in the form of a credit. The test is conducted in the form of a control interview on questions for the PA. The minimum number of points (Rpa) that can be obtained during an interview is 61, the maximum is 100 points

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

Response characteristics	ECTS assessment	Scores in BRS	The level of competence formation in the discipline	Assessment
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, a set of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, manifested in the free operation of concepts, the ability to identify its essential and non-essential signs, 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 terms of science, presented in literary language, logical, evidence-based, demonstrates the author's position of the student. The student demonstrates an advanced high level of competence formation	A	100–96	High	5 (5+)
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, a set of conscious knowledge about the object is shown, the main provisions of the topic are evidently disclosed; a clear structure, logical sequence reflecting the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, phenomena is traced in the answer. Knowledge about the object is demonstrated against the background of understanding it in the system of this science and interdisciplinary connections. The answer is presented in literary language in terms of science. There may be flaws in the definition of concepts, corrected by the student himself in the process of answering. The student demonstrates an advanced level of competence formation.	B	95–91		5
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential signs, cause-and-effect relationships is shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and presented in literary language in terms of science. There may be flaws or minor errors corrected by the student with the help of a teacher. The student demonstrates a sufficient level of competence formation.	C	90–81	Average	4
A complete, detailed answer to the question is given, the ability to identify essential and non-essential signs, cause-and-effect relationships is shown. The answer is clearly structured, logical, and stated in terms of science. However, minor errors or omissions were made, corrected by the student with the help of "leading" questions from the teacher. The student demonstrates an average level of competence formation.	D	80-76		4 (4-)

<p>A complete but insufficiently consistent answer to the question is given, but at the same time the ability to identify essential and non-essential signs and cause-and-effect relationships is shown. The answer is logical and stated in terms of science. There may be 1-2 mistakes in the definition of basic concepts, which the student finds it difficult to correct on his own. The student demonstrates a low level of competence formation.</p>	E	75-71	Low	3 (3+)
<p>An insufficiently complete and insufficiently detailed answer has been given. The logic and sequence of the 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 signs and cause-and-effect relationships. A student can concretize generalized knowledge by proving their main points by examples only with the help of a teacher. Speech design requires corrections and corrections. The student demonstrates a threshold level of competence formation.</p>	E	70-66		3
<p>An incomplete answer is given, the logic and sequence of presentation have significant violations. Gross mistakes were made in determining the essence of the disclosed concepts, theories, and phenomena, due to the student's misunderstanding of their essential and non-essential features 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 and corrections. The student demonstrates an extremely low level of competence formation.</p>	E	65-61	Extremely low	3 (3-)
<p>An incomplete answer is given, representing scattered knowledge on the topic of the question with significant errors in definitions. There is a fragmentary, illogical presentation. The student does not realize the connection of this concept, theory, phenomenon with other objects of the discipline. There are no conclusions, concretization and evidence-based presentation. The 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 of the discipline. The student demonstrates an insufficient level of competence formation.</p>	Fx	60-41		2
<p>No answers have been received on the basic questions of the discipline. The student does not demonstrate indicators of achieving the formation of competencies. There is no competence.</p>	F	40-0	Competence absent	2

3. Bonus and penalty system

This rating score calculation model provides bonuses that increase the rating score and penalties that lower the rating.

Bonuses and discipline penalties

1) The penalty system:

- for being late – 1 point
- skipping a class without a valid reason – 2 points
- skipping a lecture without a valid reason – 2 points
- non-compliance of the student's appearance with the requirements - 1 point
- working off a missed lesson later than the deadline without a valid reason – 1 point
- damage to the equipment of the department – 5 points

2) The system of rewards (bonuses):

- presentation at the scientific and practical conference of students + 3 points
- completed research work with the publication of abstracts or articles +5 points

Table 5. Final assessment of the discipline in the semester

The score is based on a 100-point system	Assessment according to the system "credited - not credited" (for credit)	Assessment according to the 5-point system (for a test with an assessment, an exam)		ECTS assessment		
100-96	Credited	5	Perfectly	A		
95-91				B		
90-81		4	Well	C		
80-76				D		
75-71				3	Adequately	E
70-66		2	Unsatisfactory			Fx
65-61						F
60-41	Not credited	2	Unsatisfactory			
40-0						

Reviewed at the meeting of the Department of Children's Diseases on May 28, 2024, Protocol No. 10

Head of the Department
of Children's Diseases, MD, Professor

M.Ya. Ledyayev