

**Assessment System with Evaluation Criteria  
Propaedeutics of Internal Diseases 1**

The educational process is organized based on a credit-modular system. At the end of the course  
Internal diseases 1 student may collect total 100 points:

Final points (100) = Exam (50) + M1 (25) + M2 (25)

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| M 1          | 25         |
| M 2          | 25         |
| Exam         | 50         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>100</b> |

The module assessment is determined by the total sum of a student's academic achievement scores, which include ongoing performance monitoring (current control), summary control, and the evaluation of completed assignments for independent work (IW) and independent work under the teacher's supervision (IWST).

**1. Chart of collection points for Module 1**

- 4marks for practical classes, Practical Current Control (PrCC)
- 4marks for lecture classes,
- 8marks for IWS,
- 9 marks for summary control, SC

*Cc-current control, SC-summary control, S-marks for IW (independent work), IWST (independent work under the supervision of a teacher)*

**M1 (25) = PrCC (4) + Lec (4) + IWST/IWS (8) + SC (9)**

PrCurrent control (CC): sum of marks of each class  
-----  
*Number of classes*

PrCC example: 
$$\frac{4 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 4}{6 \downarrow} = \frac{20}{6} = 3.3$$

Lecture Points: sum of marks of each class  
-----  
*Number of classes*

IWS/IWST: 
$$\frac{\text{sum of marks of ISW/IWST}}{\text{Number ISW/IWST}}$$

IWS example/ IWST : 
$$\frac{4 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 4}{6 \downarrow} = \frac{20}{6} = 3.3$$

**M2 (25) = PrCC (4) + Lec (4) + IWST/IWS (8) + SC (9)**

PrCurrent control (CC): 
$$\frac{\text{sum of marks of each class}}{\text{Number of classes}}$$

PrCurrent controle example: 
$$\frac{4 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 4}{6 \downarrow} = \frac{20}{6} = 3.3$$

Lecture points: 
$$\frac{\text{sum of marks of each class}}{\text{Number of classes}}$$

IWS/IWST: 
$$\frac{\text{sum of marks of ISW/IWST}}{\text{Number ISW/IWST}}$$

IWS/IWST example: 
$$\frac{4 + 4 + 3 + 3 + 2 + 4}{6 \downarrow} = \frac{20}{6} = 3.3$$

| № | Assessment tools, Tasks  | Forms of Student Academic Achievement Assessment |    |    |         |    |    |      |
|---|--|--|----|----|---------|----|----|------|
|   |  | Marks  |    |    |         |    |    |      |
|   |  | Module 1   |    |    | Module2 |    |    | Exam |
|   |  | CC   | IW | SC | CC      | IW | SC |      |
| 1 | Work during practical classes (Case control, Medical Sheet, PPT                                | 4  |    |    | 4       |    |    |      |
| 2 | Task for lecture cl  | 4  |    |    | 4       |    |    |      |
| 3 | Tasks for IWST(independent work under the supervision of a teacher)/Tasks for independent work |  | 8  |    |         | 8  |    |      |

|   |  |          |  |   |          |  |   |          |
|---|--|----------|--|---|----------|--|---|----------|
| 4 | Summary control(Assessment of Student Academic Achievements) |          |  | 9 |          |  | 9 |          |
|   |  | Up to 25 |  |   | Up to 25 |  |   | Up to 50 |
|   | Final points   | 100      |  |   |          |  |   |          |

### 1. Score points for the practical classes of Internal Disease 1:

| activities    | Name of the tasks   |  |     |     |               |   |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|---------------|---|--|-----|-----|---------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
|               | <b>Oral questioning or proper presentation of material or MCQ</b> | <b>Interpretation lab tests or images)</b> |     |     |               | <b>Practical skills (history taking, palpation, percussion and auscultation. Case Control</b> |     |     |     |     |     |  |
| Stage 1 score | Stage 2 score   |  |     |     | Stage 3 score |   |     |     |     |     |     |  |
| 4             | 4   |  |     |     | 4             |   |     |     |     |     |     |  |
| «4»           | «3»   | «2»  | «1» | «4» | «3»           | «2»   | «1» | «4» | «3» | «2» | «1» |  |

#### Formula for final grade:

Final score = (Stage 1 score + Stage 2 score): 2 = average score of Stages 1 and 2

(Average score of Stages 1 and 2 + Stage 3 score): 2 = FINAL SCORE

| Component                                     | Weight (%) | Note                             |
|---|------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 – Oral Questioning or MCQ Assessment        | 25%        | Knowledge and reasoning check    |
| 2 – Interpretation of Lab & Instrumental Data | 25%        | Knowledge recall and application |
| 3 – Case study, OR practical skills           | 50%        | Analytical and diagnostic skills |

#### 4-Point Grading oral questions

| Number of Correct Answers | Score (4-Point Scale) | Grade Description                                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 8 / 8                     | 4 – Excellent         | All answers correct; full understanding of the material |
| 6–7 / 8                   | 3 – Good              | Minor mistakes; good understanding of the material      |
| 4–5 / 8                   | 2 – Satisfactory      | Partial understanding; some errors in key concepts      |
| 0–3 / 8                   | 1 – Unsatisfactory    | Poor understanding; many mistakes                       |

#### Explanation

Total MCQs: 8

Weight per question: 0.5 points (8 × 0.5 = 4 points total)

Scoring: Each correct answer = 0.5 points

Example:

1. Student answers 7 out of 8 correctly  $\rightarrow 7 \times 0.5 = 3.5$  points  $\rightarrow$  rounded to **4 (Excellent)** or kept as 3.5 if using half-points.
2. Student answers 5 correctly  $\rightarrow 5 \times 0.5 = 2.5 \rightarrow$  **2 (Satisfactory)**

#### 4 - Score Criteria of Evaluation in Interpretation of Laboratory Tests or Medical Images

|               |   |   |  |  |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|
| Data Analysis | <b>4 – Excellent</b>  | <b>3 – Good</b>                             | <b>2 – Satisfactory</b>                            | <b>1 – Unsatisfactory</b>                |
|               | Complete and accurate interpretation of labs and imaging, correct conclusions | Mostly correct interpretation, minor errors | Partial interpretation, some incorrect conclusions | Misinterpretation or missing conclusions |

#### 4 - Score Criteria of Evaluation in Practical Skills Performance (History taking, examination, palpation, percussion and auscultation)

| Criteria              | Excellent 4  | Good 3   | Satisfactory 2                                 | Needs Improvement 1   |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|---|
| <b>History Taking</b> | Comprehensive, well-structured, asks all relevant questions, excellent patient rapport | Covers most key aspects, minor omissions                   | Asks some relevant questions but lacks depth   | Disorganized, misses major details, poor communication        |
| <b>Palpation</b>      | Uses correct technique, appropriate pressure, accurately identifies abnormalities      | Mostly correct technique, minor inconsistencies            | Some errors in technique or findings           | Incorrect technique, improper pressure, misses key findings   |
| <b>Percussion</b>     | Proper technique, good hand positioning, accurately interprets findings                | Mostly correct technique, minor errors in interpretation   | Some difficulty in technique or interpretation | Incorrect method, poor positioning, misinterprets findings    |
| <b>Auscultation</b>   | Uses stethoscope correctly, identifies normal/abnormal sounds accurately               | Mostly accurate but minor mistakes in sound interpretation | Some difficulty in differentiating sounds      | Incorrect placement, misinterprets findings, lacks confidence |

#### 4 - Score Criteria of Evaluation in Case Control in a team.

| No. | Evaluation Criteria                 | 4 – Excellent   | 3 – Good  | 2 – Fair  | 1 – Poor                               |
|-----|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| 1   | Completeness of Patient Information | All required patient data are fully and correctly recorded (name, age, complaints, history, etc.) | Most information is recorded with minor omissions   | Only part of the required information is recorded | Most required data are missing         |
| 2   | Accuracy of Medical Information     | Medical terms and clinical data are used accurately and appropriately                             | Minor inaccuracies that do not affect understanding | Several errors in medical terms or data           | Many errors; information is unreliable |
| 3   | Logical Organization                | Information is clearly organized and presented in a logical sequence                              | Generally logical with slight problems in structure | Weak organization; difficult to follow            | Disorganized and confusing             |
| 4   | Clarity and Presentation            | Writing is clear, neat, and easy to read; well-presented  | Mostly clear with minor readability issues          | Some parts are difficult to read or understand    | Poorly written and difficult to read   |

#### 2. Lecture Assessment: 4-Point Grading Based on 8 MCQs

| Number of Correct Answers | Score (4-Point Scale) | Grade Description                                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| 8 / 8                     | 4 – Excellent         | All answers correct; full understanding of the material |
| 6–7 / 8                   | 3 – Good              | Minor mistakes; good understanding of the material      |
| 4–5 / 8                   | 2 – Satisfactory      | Partial understanding; some errors in key concepts      |
| 0–3 / 8                   | 1 – Unsatisfactory    | Poor understanding; many mistakes                       |

#### 3. SWST/SWS Assessment: 4 - Point Criteria for Evaluating SWST Criteria

##### 3.1 Evaluating Medical Sheet

| No. | Criteria for Evaluating Medical Sheet | 4 – Excellent   | 3 – Good   | 2 – Satisfactory                                 | 1 – Needs Improvement                    |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 1   | Completeness of Patient Information   | All required patient information is fully documented (name, age, complaints, history, examination). | Most information is documented with minor omissions. | Only some patient information is recorded.       | Most essential patient data are missing. |
| 2   | Accuracy of Medical Data              | Medical information and terminology are completely accurate.  | Minor inaccuracies in terminology or data.           | Several mistakes in medical data or terminology. | Many errors; information is unreliable.  |

|   |                                    |  |   |   |  |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 3 | Logical Structure and Organization | Information is well organized and follows a logical clinical sequence. | Generally organized with small structural problems. | Organization is weak and difficult to follow. | Disorganized and unclear presentation. |
| 4 | Clarity and Presentation           | Medical sheet is neat, clear, and easy to read.                        | Mostly clear with minor readability issues.         | Some parts are difficult to read or unclear.  | Poorly written and difficult to read.  |

### 3.2. Evaluating Patient-Doctor Role-Playing in a Team - 4 points

| Criteria   | Excellent (4 points)  | Good (3 points)   | Satisfactory (2 points)  | Needs Improvement (0-1 point)                        |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Communication Skills</b>                      | Clear, empathetic, professional, and patient-centered communication                           | Mostly clear, some minor communication gaps               | Some difficulty in expressing ideas or maintaining professionalism | Poor communication, lacks clarity or empathy         |
| <b>Clinical Knowledge &amp; Decision- Making</b> | Demonstrates accurate knowledge, asks relevant questions, and provides appropriate management | Mostly accurate, but minor gaps in reasoning or knowledge | Basic understanding, but lacks confidence and depth                | Weak knowledge, incorrect approach, lacks confidence |
| <b>Team Collaboration</b>                        | Works effectively with team, ensures smooth interaction between doctor and patient roles      | Good collaboration, minor coordination issues             | Some teamwork issues, uneven participation                         | Poor teamwork, minimal participation or interaction  |
| <b>Empathy &amp; Professionalism</b>             | Shows strong empathy, active listening, and ethical conduct                                   | Mostly professional and empathetic, with minor lapses     | Some effort in empathy but lacks consistency                       | Lacks empathy, unprofessional behavior               |