

**MINISTRY OF DEFENCE OF UKRAINE
MILITARY ACADEMY (Odesa)**

**REGULATIONS
on the Monitoring and Assessment of Academic
Achievements of Higher Education Applicants at the
Military Academy (Odesa)**

Odesa
2024

**MINISTRY OF DEFENCE OF UKRAINE
MILITARY ACADEMY (Odesa)**

Enacted by order of the Commandant
of the Military Academy (Odesa)
dated
" ____ " _____ 2024 No. ____

**REGULATIONS
on the Monitoring and Assessment of Academic
Achievements of Higher Education Applicants at the
Military Academy (Odesa)**

Approved by the Academic
Council of the Military
Academy (Odesa) dated
17 September 2024 No. 2

The Regulation on the Monitoring and Assessment of Academic Achievements of Higher Education Applicants was developed by a team of staff from the educational department and experienced academic-pedagogical employees of the Academy under the general supervision of the Deputy Academy Commandant for Education, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Colonel Oleh Masliy.

Development Team:

Colonel A. Boyarskyi – Head of the Academy's Educational Department;
Lieutenant Colonel S. Kushko – Senior Assistant to the Head of the Educational Department;
Employee of the Armed Forces of Ukraine V. Mudrov – Head of the Educational and Methodological Department;
Employee of the Armed Forces of Ukraine S. Klyuchnik – Methodologist of the Educational and Methodological Department.

CONTENTS

1.	GENERAL PROVISIONS.	5
2.	ORGANIZATION OF CONTROL MEASURES AT THE ACADEMY.	5
3.	ASSESSMENT AND DETERMINATION OF LEARNING OUTCOMES. CONDITIONS FOR ADMISSION TO THE CREDIT (EXAM).	19
4.	DETERMINATION AND DISCLOSURE OF THE OVERALL RATING OF HIGHER EDUCATION APPLICANTS.	48
5.	FINAL PROVISIONS	48
6.	Appendix 1. INDIVIDUAL SCHEDULE FOR TAKING EXAMS (DIFFERENTIATED CREDITS) BY A CADET.	49

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

1.1. The Regulation on the Monitoring and Assessment of Academic Achievements of Higher Education Applicants (hereinafter – the Regulation) at the Military Academy (Odesa) (hereinafter – the Academy) is a regulatory document of the Academy. It defines the goal, main tasks, principles, and mechanism for implementing the rating assessment of the achievements of the Academy's higher education applicants in accordance with pan-European requirements and the requirements of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) in teaching, the procedure for conducting monitoring, and the application of rating assessment during the certification of higher education applicants.

The Regulation applies to all participants in the educational process of the Academy.

1.2. The Regulation on the Monitoring and Assessment of Academic Achievements of Higher Education Applicants at the Military Academy (Odesa) was developed in accordance with the Constitution of Ukraine, the Laws of Ukraine "On Education", "On Higher Education", other laws, higher education standards, normative and regulatory legal acts of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (hereinafter – MES of Ukraine) and the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine (hereinafter – MOD of Ukraine), the Academy's Statute, the Academy's Development Strategy, the Regulation on the Organization of the Educational Process at the Military Academy (Odesa), and other regulatory legal acts on security and defence of Ukraine that regulate the procedure for monitoring and assessing the academic achievements of higher education applicants.

1. ORGANIZATION OF CONTROL MEASURES AT THE ACADEMY

2.1. Control measures are a necessary element of feedback in the Academy's educational process. They determine the correspondence of the level of knowledge and skills acquired and competencies formed by higher education applicants to the requirements of normative documents regarding higher military education, and ensure the timely adjustment of the educational process.

2.2. The main task of educational process control is to obtain information about its properties and results for the purpose of effective management of the process and its optimization, achieving a high quality of training for higher education applicants. Thus, the main function of educational process control is diagnostic-corrective.

In addition, the tasks of control may include:

- Determining the academic success of higher education applicants for the purpose of planning the subsequent stages of the educational process;
- Identifying gaps in the learning of individual higher education applicants for the purpose of optimizing the individual learning process and motivating higher education applicants;

- Determining the extent to which higher education applicants have mastered the content of their studies for the purpose of transferring them to the next year of study (semester control of higher education applicants);
- Establishing the actual conformity of the level of training of higher education applicants with the requirements of higher education standards and issuing a document on the acquired higher education degree (qualification – where assigned).

In all the cases listed above, the controlling and diagnostic-corrective functions are realized.

Other functions may also be performed during the control of the educational process: teaching, motivational-stimulating, organizing, and upbringing (educational), etc.

The Academy uses the following types of control: entry (preliminary), current (ongoing), self-control, intermediate semester, semester, and final (summative).

The requirements of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) must be met when applying control measures.

2.3. Entry Control (Preliminary Control) is the check of an applicant's knowledge, applied as a prerequisite for the successful organization of the study of a discipline. Entry control is conducted before studying a new academic discipline to determine the level of preparation of education applicants in that discipline or related disciplines that precede its study.

The control results are analyzed at department (interdepartmental) meetings jointly with the academic-pedagogical staff of the departments where the previous academic disciplines were studied. Based on the results of the entry control, measures are developed to provide individual assistance to higher education applicants and to adjust the educational process.

2.4. Current Control (Ongoing Control) is conducted by instructors during all types of classroom (auditory) sessions throughout the semester (half-year) according to the schedule. The main task of current control is to check the level of preparation of the education applicant on a defined topic (learning element). The main goal of current control is to ensure feedback between the instructors and the education applicant and to manage the applicant's learning motivation. The information obtained from current control is used by the instructor to adjust teaching methods and means and by the education applicant to plan independent work. Special types of current control include colloquium and summative control (control work/assignment) for topics.

Current control may be conducted in the form of oral questioning, written express-control, applicant presentations during theoretical question discussions, solving written assignments, practical situations, as well as in the form of computer testing, etc.

The forms of current control and its quantitative assessment for a specific type of educational session are determined according to the criteria regulated by the academic discipline's syllabus (work programme). The results of current control (current academic progress) are the primary information used when conducting a credit (exam) and are taken into account by the academic-pedagogical staff member when determining the final grade for the academic discipline.

2.5. Self-Control is intended for the independent checking by the education applicant of the degree of mastery of the learning material for a specific academic discipline (topic, session). For this purpose, questions for self-control are provided in the methodological guidelines for the independent work of education applicants. The effectiveness of self-control is ensured by special self-control and self-assessment programmes, which are integral parts of electronic textbooks and automated training courses.

2.6. Intermediate Control is the control of the knowledge, skills, and habits of higher education applicants after studying a logically complete part (topic, section) of the academic discipline's programme. Intermediate control may be conducted in the form of oral questioning, a control work (test), testing, etc.

The results of intermediate control are additional information when conducting the credit and are taken into account by the academic-pedagogical staff member when determining the final examination grade for the given academic discipline.

2.7. Final Control (Summative Control) is a form of control for the education applicant's mastery of the theoretical and practical material of a specific academic discipline (educational component), conducted as a control measure. The purpose of final control is the comprehensive assessment of the level of formation of learning outcomes for the academic discipline over a semester (half-year) or academic year.

The forms of final control for academic disciplines (educational components) of the educational-professional (educational-scientific) programme are a credit or an exam.

If an academic discipline is taught over several semesters, intermediate semester control is generally conducted in the form of a credit. The final grade for an academic discipline studied over several semesters is determined by taking into account the results from previous semesters.

Final control may be carried out orally, in writing, or using computer testing with the application of distance learning technologies, with the aim of establishing whether the education applicants have achieved the learning outcomes.

Based on the results of final control, ECTS credits are established and awarded to the education applicant for the components of the curriculum (academic disciplines, practical training, military internship, course works, and qualification works).

2.8. Semester Control is a type of final control that reveals the level of the education applicant's mastery of an academic discipline or its separate, logically complete part for the semester, taking into account the results of current control.

Semester control for an academic discipline is conducted in accordance with the curriculum in the form of an exam or credit within the deadlines set by the academic process calendar-schedule and covering the scope of educational material defined by the academic discipline's syllabus (work programme). The form of semester control is chosen according to the level of competencies being formed. The content and structure of examination tickets (control tasks), admission criteria, and the assessment procedure are brought to the attention of the education applicant at the first lesson.

The results of semester control are used as a criterion for the education applicant's fulfilment of the curriculum.

Part-time (distance) education applicants complete the individual assignments (control works, course works/projects, etc.) stipulated by the curriculum and submit them to the departments at the beginning of the regular training session, and must do so before the control measures for the academic discipline are conducted.

For part-time education applicants, the schedule of sessions, credits, and exams is drawn up according to the academic process calendar-schedule.

2.8.1. The form of semester control (oral, written, combined, testing, etc.), organizational and methodological guidelines, the list (content) of control tasks, the structure of examination tickets (control tasks), the distribution of points received by education applicants during semester control, the requirements for assessing the knowledge, skills, and habits of education applicants, the procedure for appealing the results of control measures and their retaking, etc., are defined in the programme for conducting the credit (exam). This programme is discussed and approved at a department meeting and is approved by the Head (Chair) of the department and brought to the attention of the education applicant at the first session.

2.8.2. Examination tickets and practical questions (practical tasks, problems) for conducting semester control, a list of educational aids and visual reference materials (a list of diagrams, tables, formulas, reference books, models, and other aids, etc.) that higher education applicants may use during the credit (exam), are discussed at the department meeting (subject-methodological commission) and approved by the Head (Chair) of the department no later than 14 calendar days before the start of the credit (exam). The named materials are valid throughout the academic year, are a component of the educational and methodological materials for each academic discipline, and are stored in the department.

2.9. The presence of higher education applicants during the conduct of final (semester) control (credit or exam) is mandatory.

2.10. The grades of the final (semester) control are announced to the higher education applicant after the completion of the credit (exam).

Positive grades for control measures are entered into the statement of academic progress (grade sheet) of the education applicants, the record book (individual curriculum), and the academic card of the education applicant.

Both positive and negative grades are entered into the statement of academic progress, academic cards, and journals of session attendance for the study group.

The learning outcomes, which are reflected in the higher education applicant's academic card and academic progress statements, serve as the basis for the faculty's educational unit to issue an academic transcript.

2.11. For academic disciplines that are complex and large in volume (multi-semester academic disciplines), two or more exams (credits) may be scheduled. In this case, a weighted average grade is additionally entered into the higher education applicant's academic card, which will be considered later in the Diploma Supplement. The weighted average grade is calculated using the following formula:

$$Rwa = \frac{R_{1sem} \cdot V_{1sem}}{V_{discipline}} + \frac{R_{2sem} \cdot V_{2sem}}{V_{discipline}} + \frac{R_{i sem} \cdot V_{i sem}}{V_{discipline}}$$

$$Rwa = V_{discipline} R_{1sem} \cdot V_{1sem} + R_{2sem} \cdot V_{2sem} + \dots + R_{i sem} \cdot V_{i sem}$$

Where:

Rwa is the weighted average grade;

R1sem, R2sem, Risem are the grades for the semester control of the discipline;

V 1sem, V 2sem, V i sem are the volume of the discipline studied in the corresponding semester;

V discipline is the total volume of the discipline.

After calculating the weighted average grade, the grade is rounded according to mathematical laws.

For example: A discipline with a volume of 12 ECTS credits was taught over 4 semesters: in the first semester, 4 ECTS credits were taught, the semester grade was "Satisfactory," 60 points; in the second semester, 3 ECTS credits were taught, the semester grade was "Very Good," 84 points; in the third semester, 3 ECTS credits were taught, the semester grade was "Good," 79 points; in the fourth semester, 2 ECTS credits were taught, the semester grade was "Excellent," 95 points. The weighted average grade is calculated using the formula:

$$R_{C30} = \frac{60 \times 4}{12} + \frac{84 \times 3}{12} + \frac{79 \times 3}{12} + \frac{95 \times 2}{12} = \frac{240}{12} + \frac{252}{12} + \frac{237}{12} + \frac{190}{12} = \frac{1003}{12} = 83,58$$

Rounding the obtained result according to mathematical rules, we get a weighted average grade for the discipline of 84 points, which corresponds to "Very Good" on the national scale.

2.12. Higher education applicants may be allowed to take the final (semester) control (credit, exam) according to an individual schedule based on a decision by the Head of the Academy due to necessity.

The forms for the individual schedule are provided in Appendix 1.

2.13. The Head of the Academy, their deputies, the Head of the Educational Department, the Deputy Head of the Educational Department (representatives of the Educational Department), Faculty Heads and their deputies, and the Head (Chair) of the Department and their deputies have the right to be present at the credit (exam). The presence of unauthorized persons during the final (semester) control is not allowed without permission from the Commandant of the Academy or the Deputy Commandant of the Academy for Education.

2.14. A Credit is a type of final (semester) control conducted at the end of an academic discipline (semester) with the aim of checking the degree of mastery of the educational material of the discipline studied during the semester in accordance with the curriculum and the academic discipline's syllabus (work programme).

To prepare for a credit in the form of a separate control measure, up to one academic day may be provided, if necessary, by utilizing the time allocated for the independent study of the relevant academic discipline.

2.15. An exam is a type of final (semester) control conducted through a comprehensive assessment of the level of formation of learning outcomes for the academic discipline over a semester (half-year) or academic year.

Exams are taken by higher education applicants according to the session schedule (examination session schedule). The examination session schedule is developed by the faculty's educational unit, signed by the Faculty Head, and brought to the attention of the academic-pedagogical staff and the higher education applicants no later than 14 calendar days before the start of the examination sessions.

If the form of final control for an academic discipline is an exam(s), one ECTS credit is allocated for preparation and completion of each exam.

A consultation must be held before each credit (exam).

The exam is administered by the lecturer who delivered the lectures for the educational component (academic discipline). By decision of the Head (Chair) of the Department, other academic-pedagogical staff of the department who conducted sessions in the examining group may be appointed to assist the main examiner. If lectures for the educational component (academic discipline) were delivered by several academic-pedagogical staff, a commission is established by decision of the Head (Chair) of the Department to administer the exam.

Organization of Final Control Measures

2.16. On the eve of a credit (exam), the faculty's educational unit prepares two copies of the Academic Progress Statement (Grade Sheet) in the established form. After the credit (exam), these statements are stored as strictly accountable documents: one copy in the Academy's Educational Department, and the second in the faculty's educational unit.

The Academic Progress Statement specifies: the name of the faculty, the level of higher education, the status of the higher education applicants, the field of knowledge, specialty, specialization, the name of the educational programme, the year of study, the number of the study group, the academic year, the statement number, the date of the credit (exam), the name of the educational component (academic discipline), the total number of hours, the form of final control, the number of the semester in which the credit (exam) will be taken, the full name of the department administering the credit (exam), and the academic title, surname, and initials of the instructor assigning the final grade. The military ranks, surnames, and initials of the study group's higher education applicants (in alphabetical order) and the number of the individual curriculum are entered into the statement.

The Head of the Faculty signs the Academic Progress Statements.

For higher education applicants who have taken the credit (exam) according to an individual schedule, the entry "passed under indiv. schedule" is made in the "Grade" column opposite their surnames, and the signature of the Head of the Faculty or the Deputy Head of the Faculty for Academic and Scientific Work – Head of the Educational Unit is affixed. If a higher education applicant is on medical leave, vacation, business trip, etc., the entry "on leave," "on vacation," or "on business trip" is made in the "Grade" column opposite their surname, signed by the Head of the Faculty or the Deputy Head of the Faculty for Academic and Scientific Work – Head of the Educational Unit, with the date and number of the Academy Head's order indicated. If the results of an educational component have been recognized for a higher education applicant through credit transfer, the entry "credit transferred" is made in the "Grade" column, signed by the Head of the Faculty.

The Academic Progress Statements, in two copies, are registered in the faculty's educational unit in the "Journal of Registration of Academic Progress Statements for Higher Education Applicants of the Faculty for the Academic Year."

The instructor signs in the "Journal of Registration of Academic Progress Statements for Higher Education Applicants of the Faculty for the Academic Year" upon receiving the Academic Progress Statement.

The instructor who conducts the final (semester) control receives the completed and registered Academic Progress Statement from the faculty's educational unit on the day before the control.

The instructor fills out the Academic Progress Statements for higher education applicants clearly, using blue or black ink, and without corrections.

Opposite the surnames of higher education applicants who failed to appear for the final control without valid reasons, the instructor makes the entry "did not appear" in the "Grade" column.

2.17. Immediately after conducting the final (semester) control, the instructor returns the two copies of the Academic Progress Statement to the faculty's educational unit. Upon the return of the Academic Progress Statement, the faculty clerk or the responsible person signs for receipt of the statement in the "Journal of Registration of Academic Progress Statements for Higher Education Applicants of the Faculty for the Academic Year."

After checking, the faculty's educational unit submits the first copy of the Academic Progress Statement to the Academy's Educational Department, and the second copy is stored in the faculty's educational unit.

2.18. The academic cards of higher education applicants and the second copy of the Academic Progress Statement are stored in the educational units of the faculties. The first copy of the Academic Progress Statements is stored in the Academy's Educational Department.

2.19. During the credit (exam), the instructor must have:

The programme for conducting the credit (exam);

The education applicants' record books;

The Academic Progress Statements (2 copies);

Examination tickets (control tasks for the credit/exam);

The academic discipline's syllabus (work programme), which defines the rating system for assessing the cadet's (trainee, adjunct, student) performance in the discipline, the conditions for admission to the credit (exam), and the assessment of the cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) during the credit (exam);

A list of educational aids and visual reference materials (list of diagrams, tables, formulas, reference books, models, and other aids, etc.) that higher education applicants may use during the credit (exam). This list is communicated to the higher education applicants during the consultation while the study group prepares for the credit (exam);

The session attendance journal of the study group;

Examination sheets (with the instructor's mark, if necessary) on which the cadets record their answers (working notes) to the questions on the examination ticket (control task).

2.20. Responsibility for preparing the classroom (or other educational premises) for the credit (exam) lies with the unit commander whose education applicants are taking the credit (exam) and the head of the educational and laboratory complex or the head of the department's laboratory (room), if the credit (exam) is held in a department classroom.

10 minutes before the start of the credit (exam), the unit commander (course officer, study group commander) introduces the study group to the examiner (instructor). After this, the examiner (instructor) instructs the personnel of the study group on the procedure for conducting the credit (exam), specifically: the number of higher education applicants who may be in the classroom simultaneously; the procedure for using diagrams, tables, formulas, reference books, models, and other aids that higher education applicants may use during the credit (exam); the prohibition of using mobile phones and other devices.

After the briefing, the first education applicants enter the classroom sequentially to take the credit (exam), and the rest proceed to the preparation classroom to prepare for the credit (exam).

No more than 5 education applicants should be in the classroom where an oral credit (exam) is conducted, and if two or more instructors are administering the credit (exam), no more than 10 persons taking the exam (credit).

2.21. A written credit (exam) is conducted in the following order:

Higher education applicants are seated in classrooms that ensure comfortable individual work, with 1-2 applicants per desk;

Before the start of the credit (exam), the education applicants are given the tasks and the educational aids permitted for use during the exam (credit), along with the necessary supplies and other materials for completing the assignment. Simultaneously with the task, the necessary number of blank sheets of paper (with the instructor's mark, if necessary) is issued for drafts and the final submission of the work. Using sheets of paper other than those issued is prohibited;

All issued sheets of paper must be handed in to the person administering the credit (exam) upon completion of the work. If the written work consists of several independent problems, only those problems that must be completed before the break (or before the end of the first period) are issued at the start of the credit (exam);

The examiner (instructor) only permits individual higher education applicants to leave the classroom where the written credit (exam) is being held in cases of extreme necessity. In such a case, the higher education applicant is obligated to hand in their work to the person administering the credit (exam);

Works must be performed by the higher education applicant neatly, clearly, and legibly, without the possibility of dual interpretation;

Higher education applicants who have completed their work hand it in to the examiner (instructor) and leave the classroom with their permission. The time of submission is noted on each work. Upon the expiration of the established period for the exam (credit), all works are handed in to the examiner (instructor).

When an exam is administered by a commission (subcommission), the written works are distributed among the commission members for checking. The grades assigned by them for the work are approved by the head of the commission (subcommission).

2.22. An Oral Credit (Exam) is conducted using control tasks (examination tickets) in the following order:

A portion of the higher education applicants are called by the examiner (instructor) to take the credit (exam), while the rest of the study group remains outside the classroom, in the classroom designated for preparation for the credit (exam);

The called applicant, after reporting their arrival for the credit (exam), presents their record book to the examiner (instructor). They then take a control task (ticket), state its number, familiarize themselves with the questions, report whether the questions are understood or not understood, clarify them if necessary, receive clean examination sheets (with the department's stamp) for recording answers and solving problems, and then prepare their response;

When ready to answer or upon the end of the allotted preparation time, the applicant, with the permission of the examiner (instructor) or at their call, answers the questions posed in the control task (ticket).

An education applicant entering the classroom is obligated to:

Report their arrival for the credit (exam), for example: "Sir/Madam Colonel (Instructor), Sergeant Petrenko has arrived for the credit (exam) in the academic discipline (stating the full name of the academic discipline)," and present their record book. The examiner (instructor) has the right to demand arrival for the credit (exam) with lecture notes, a notebook with group (practical) session records, laboratory work reports, homework assignments, etc;

With the permission of the examiner (instructor), take one control task (one ticket), familiarize themselves with the content of the questions, and report: "Sir/Madam Colonel (Instructor), Control Task No. (Ticket No. __), questions understood (not understood)," and with the permission of the examiner (instructor), begin preparation for the answer. Education applicants are allowed to take only one ticket for the credit (exam). If the examinee reports that they cannot answer the questions on the ticket, they are assigned a grade of "Unsatisfactory".

Having received the examination sheet from the instructor, the education applicant writes their military rank, surname, control task (ticket) number, and the time of receipt on it, and begins the written answer to the questions on the control task (ticket). While preparing the answer, the applicant draws up a plan or writes an outline of the answer, makes drawings, diagrams, calculations, etc., on the examination sheet (or blackboard), using only permitted materials, and selects necessary posters, diagrams, etc., for the answer. At least 30 minutes are allotted for preparation for the answer. If necessary, this time may be extended with the instructor's permission.

When ready to answer and after answering the questions, the applicant reports, for example: "Sir/Madam Colonel (Instructor), Sergeant Petrenko is ready to answer," or "Sir/Madam Colonel (Instructor), Sergeant Petrenko has finished the answer to the first question."

2.23. When a credit (exam) is administered by a commission (subcommission), the answers are heard by the entire composition of the commission (subcommission). For individual questions that require practical work performance on armaments and equipment, answers may be heard by a single member of the commission (subcommission) as instructed by the chairman. After answering the ticket questions, the education applicant reports this to the person administering the credit (exam).

After completing the answer to the control task (examination ticket), the higher education applicant reports: "Sir/Madam Colonel (Instructor), Sergeant Petrenko has finished the answer to Control Task (Examination Ticket) No. ___." The instructor may ask additional questions regarding the essence of the answer if necessary.

The commission (subcommission) members take brief notes on the higher education applicants' answers, assign grades for the answers to each main question on the ticket, a grade for the additional questions, and an overall grade based on the results of the credit (exam).

After the grade is announced, the education applicant, with the permission of the examiner (instructor), leaves the classroom and proceeds to the classroom designated for the study group's preparation for the credit (exam).

2.24. The examiner (instructor) is obliged to demonstrate a high level of demandingness regarding the examinees' knowledge, the neatness and accuracy of their written records, their ability to use drafting tools and a pointer when necessary, and their use of military-professional terminology.

Their understanding of the essence of the theoretical knowledge presented, when solving practical problems, must be revealed especially deeply and thoroughly.

If the material is fully presented in the written notes, the examiner (instructor) has the right to allow the education applicant not to fully present the answer but only to clarify specific points. Furthermore, they may exempt the education applicant from a complete answer if they are confident in the depth of their knowledge. After answering the ticket questions, the education applicant hands the examination sheet to the examiner (instructor).

2.25. The grade is announced to the education applicant immediately after the end of the credit (exam). If the exam is conducted with a separate check of the level of theoretical knowledge and the quality of practical training, a single grade is assigned to the higher education applicant based on the results of passing such an exam.

2.26. In case of a breach of academic integrity: if a higher education applicant uses unauthorized aids and other materials, a mobile phone, or other devices, the examiner (instructor) has the right to remove them from the credit (exam), assign them an unsatisfactory grade, and report this to the Head (Chair) of

the Department. Every such breach of academic integrity is subject to review by the Head of the Faculty, with the application of disciplinary measures.

If persons with the right of control are present at the credit (exam), questioning begins and ends with their permission.

Questions to the education applicant, besides those from the examiner (instructor), may be asked by persons who have the right to control the credit (exam). In all cases, the grade is assigned by the examiner (instructor).

2.27. The results of the higher education applicants' answers are assessed based on the assessment criteria for completing the control task (answering the ticket questions) and the procedure for applying the rating system for assessing the academic performance of the cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) in the academic discipline, which is defined by the academic discipline's syllabus (work programme).

The examiner (instructor) bears personal responsibility for the correctness and objectivity of the assigned grade. Any attempt by anyone to directly or indirectly influence the examiner (instructor) administering the credit (exam) with the aim of changing the assigned grade is a gross violation of academic integrity. The examiner (instructor) immediately reports all such cases through the chain of command.

2.28. After conducting the credit (exam), the examiner (instructor) records the results of the credit (exam) in the Academic Progress Statements (each grade is certified by their signature), then in the record book, and enters the grades in the study group's session attendance journal, making a note about the fulfillment of the curriculum. For example: "The academic discipline programme has been completed in full, totaling [number] hours." Signature and date.

The grade "Unsatisfactory" is entered by the instructor only in the Academic Progress Statement and the study group's session attendance journal.

2.29. After the credit (exam), the study group commander forms up the personnel and presents them to the examiner (instructor) for summarizing the results of the credit (exam). If necessary, the examiner (instructor) petitions the command for the commending of those who excelled. Then, the study group commander leads the personnel back to the unit and acts according to the instructions of the course head.

Retaking of Final (Semester) Control

2.30. A mandatory condition for satisfactory certification during final (semester) control is the absence of arrears in laboratory works and the presence of positive grades obtained by the education applicant for the completion of individual assignments (essay, control work, calculation work, calculation-graphic assignments, course project/work).

2.31. Education applicants who have not completed individual assignments (have arrears in laboratory works, have unsatisfactory grades for completing an essay, control work, calculation work, calculation-graphic assignments, course project/work) or who received unsatisfactory grades during the credit (exam) are admitted to retakes of the credit (exam) within the deadlines defined by the retake schedule for credits (exams).

2.32. On the day following the end of the final control, the faculty's educational unit draws up and submits to the Academy's Educational Department a schedule for retaking credits (exams), which defines the deadlines for the first and second retakes of credits (exams). Repeated retaking of a credit (exam) is allowed no more than twice. The second retake of a credit (exam) for higher education applicants is administered by a commission appointed by the Head (Chair) of the Department, consisting of three persons, one of whom is the instructor who administered the first retake.

2.33. When retaking a credit (exam), the examiner (instructor) may simultaneously conduct the control measure with education applicants from different study groups who have academic arrears in the given academic discipline.

2.34. On the eve of the credit (exam) retake, the faculty's educational unit prepares a Grade Sheet in the established form in two copies, which are signed by the Head of the Faculty and registered in the "Journal of Registration of Academic Progress Statements for Higher Education Applicants of the Faculty for the Academic Year."

The instructor who conducts the credit (exam) retake receives the Grade Sheet from the faculty's educational unit on the eve of the retake. Upon receiving the Grade Sheet, the instructor signs in the "Journal of Registration of Academic Progress Statements for Higher Education Applicants of the Faculty for the Academic Year."

Immediately after conducting the credit (exam) retake, the instructor returns the two copies of the Grade Sheet to the faculty's educational unit. Upon the return of the Grade Sheet, the faculty clerk or the responsible person signs for receipt of the sheet in the "Journal of Registration of Academic Progress Statements for Higher Education Applicants of the Faculty for the Academic Year."

After the Grade Sheet is checked in the faculty's educational unit, one copy is provided to the Academy's Educational Department, and the second copy remains in the faculty's educational unit.

2.35. Education applicants who failed to take the credit (exam) during the final (semester) control within the established deadlines due to valid reasons (illness, vacation, business trip, family circumstances, etc.), confirmed by documentation, are permitted to take the credit (exam) according to an individual schedule by decision of the Head of the Academy.

2.36. The individual schedule for taking the credit (exam) is drawn up by the faculty's educational unit together with the education applicant, defining the form of semester control for the academic discipline, the deadline and location for the retake, and the name of the instructor. The individual schedule for taking the credit (exam) is signed by the education applicant, signed by the Head of the Faculty,

approved by the Deputy Commandant of the Academy for Academic Affairs and the Head (Chair) of the Department where the academic discipline is studied, and approved by the Head of the Academy.

2.37. Education applicants who received "Unsatisfactory" grades in three or more academic disciplines during the final (semester) control, or who received an "Unsatisfactory" grade during the second commission retake of a credit (exam), are expelled from the Academy. The Head of the Faculty submits a report to the Head of the Academy regarding the expulsion of the education applicants from the Academy for academic failure.

2.38. The issues of recognition of learning outcomes through credit transfer and the recognition of learning outcomes during the transfer of higher education applicants from another educational institution or study under a different educational programme (EP), their readmission to the Academy, based on learning outcomes within academic mobility programmes, based on the results of admission to the first (Bachelor's) level on the basis of the "Junior Specialist" educational level, and the elimination of the academic difference for higher education applicants who studied at other educational institutions are regulated by the Regulation on the Procedure for the Recognition of Learning Outcomes in the Military Academy (Odesa) obtained in Other Higher Education Institutions and in Non-formal Education.

Procedure for Appealing the Results of Control Measures and Their Retaking

2.39. In case an education applicant disagrees with the final grade assigned by the instructor (examiner), they may appeal it by initiating the procedure for appealing the results of the control measure by submitting a motivated petition (report) addressed to the Head (Chair) of the Department. If a positive decision is made, the Head (Chair) of the Department is granted the right to appoint a commission of department instructors for a repeated administration of the credit (exam), which is reported to the faculty's educational unit, and a Grade Sheet for the retake is prepared. If time is available, the repeated taking is postponed until the 4th period of the same day or the next day (if the next day is a day off/holiday, then the nearest working day). The commission must mandatorily include: the Head (Chair) of the Department (or in their absence/leave/business trip/illness - the Deputy Head (Chair) of the Department or another official substituting them in accordance with the order), the lead instructor for that discipline, and the course head. The procedure for the retake does not differ from regular credits (exams) and includes the selection of an examination ticket, preparation for the answer, the answer itself, additional questions, and assessment. The education applicant may appeal the result of the repeated credit (exam) retake by submitting a motivated petition (report) addressed to the Head of the Faculty. Subsequently, the composition of the commission is determined by the faculty's educational unit.

3. ASSESSMENT AND DETERMINATION OF LEARNING OUTCOMES. CONDITIONS FOR ADMISSION TO THE CREDIT (EXAM)

3.1. The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) has been introduced at the Academy for the organization of the educational process. For the assessment of education applicants' learning outcomes during final (semester) control, a Rating Assessment System (RAS) has been implemented at the Academy, utilizing an accumulative point scale and an extended assessment scale for education applicants' knowledge.

3.2. The assessment of education applicants' learning outcomes for an academic discipline is carried out based on the RAS during the learning process, which includes the accumulative point scale and the extended scale for assigning exam (credit) grades. The assessment of learning outcomes for educational components is carried out based on the RAS according to the results of the completed assignment. The distribution of points on the accumulative point scale and the grades are carried out using a 100-point scale and the National Scale (Extended Scale), as defined in Table 1.

100-Point Scale	National Scale	Assessment Criteria	Table 1. Competency Level
90-100	"Excellent"	The education applicant demonstrates special creative abilities, can independently acquire knowledge, finds and processes necessary information without the instructor's help, can use acquired knowledge and skills to make decisions in non-standard situations, convincingly argues answers, and independently reveals their own talents and inclinations.	High
80-89	"Very Good"	The education applicant is proficient in the studied volume of educational material, applies it in practice, freely solves exercises and problems in standard situations, and independently corrects minor errors.	Sufficient
65-79	"Good"	The education applicant can compare, generalize, and systematize information under the instructor's guidance; generally applies it in practice independently, monitors their own activity; corrects errors, including significant ones, and selects arguments to support opinions.	Sufficient
55-64	"Satisfactory"	The education applicant reproduces a significant part of the theoretical material, demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the basic provisions; with the instructor's help, they can analyse the educational material and correct errors, including a significant number of substantial ones.	Medium
50-54	"Sufficient"	The education applicant possesses the educational material at a level higher than elementary, and reproduces a significant part of it at the reproductive level.	Medium
1-49	"Unsatisfactory" with the possibility of retaking	The education applicant possesses the material only at the level of individual fragments, constituting an insignificant part of the educational material.	Low

The size of the RAS scale for the educational component (academic discipline, course work/project, practical training, military internship, qualification work) is 100 points.

The objectives of the rating assessment system are:

Intensification of the educational process and improvement of the quality of military specialist training;

Increasing the motivation of education applicants for active, conscious learning, systematic independent work throughout the semester, and responsibility for the results of educational activity;

Establishing constant feedback with each education applicant and timely correction of their educational activities;

Ensuring competitiveness and healthy competition in learning;

Increasing the objectivity of assessing education applicants' learning outcomes;

Reducing psychological, emotional, and physical overloads during examination sessions.

3.3. Education applicants must be informed promptly of all rating points received. The values of the current ratings of education applicants in an academic discipline must be systematically communicated to the applicants, and if necessary, to the heads of the faculty (departments) for the purpose of adjusting the educational process and managing the educational activities of each higher education applicant.

3.4. Education applicants who were not admitted to the final (semester) control in an academic discipline must eliminate the reasons that led to this during their independent study time.

3.5. The Rating Assessment System for the academic performance of education applicants in **the full-time study** format for the department's educational component, including the system of rating (weight) points and criteria for current assessment, which establishes the specifics of the rating, the methodology for its calculation, and the principles of its use, are discussed and approved at a department meeting, included as a section in the academic discipline's syllabus (work programme), and communicated to the education applicants at the first session.

Conditions for Admission of Full-Time Education Applicants to the Credit (Exam)

3.6. A cadet can accumulate a maximum rating score of 100 points during the semester. The maximum rating score for completing the control task of the credit (exam) is 100 points.

3.7. A cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) is admitted to the credit (exam) if, before the start of the credit (exam), they have cleared all arrears for all types of work stipulated by the academic discipline's syllabus and have scored more than 49 points.

3.8. The increase of the cadet's (trainee, adjunct, student) rating score (in points) for an academic discipline occurs at the expense of the time allocated for independent work.

3.9. A cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) who has scored a semester rating of 50 to 79 points inclusive is obligated to complete the control task of the credit (exam). In this case, the semester rating score (total points) for the academic discipline is cancelled, and they receive the rating score (points) only for the result of completing the credit (exam) control task.

3.10. A cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) who has scored a semester rating of 80 points or more in the academic discipline has the following options:

- Receive the credit/exam grade without completing the control task ("automatically") according to the accumulated rating score (in points);
- Complete the control task of the credit (exam) in order to increase the grade.

3.11. If a cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) has scored 80 points or more during the semester and does not wish to increase the grade (total points), the instructor records the semester rating score (total points) for the academic discipline in the Academic Progress Statement.

3.12. If a cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) has scored 80 points or more during the semester and wishes to increase the rating score (total points), they complete the control task of the credit (exam). In this case, the semester rating score (total points) for the academic discipline is cancelled, and they receive the rating score (points) only for the result of completing the credit (exam) control task.

3.13. If a cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) scores 1 to 49 points based on the result of completing the credit (exam) control task, they receive an "Unsatisfactory" grade with the possibility of retaking the credit (exam).

3.14. Conditions for Admission and Taking the Exam for the Academic Discipline "Driving of Combat Vehicles."

Taking the exam (completing the control driving exercise) for the academic discipline "Driving of Combat Vehicles" is mandatory for all cadets, regardless of current academic performance (requirements of the Course of Driving Combat Vehicles). Therefore, receiving a credit/exam grade without completing the control task ("automatically") according to the accumulated rating score (in points) is not possible.

The education applicant is admitted to the exam if, before the start of the exam, they have cleared all arrears for all types of work and completed all exercises stipulated by the academic discipline's syllabus.

If a cadet has not completed at least one of the exercises stipulated by the academic discipline's syllabus, admission is granted only after clearing the arrears during an additional session, which is planned by the faculty's educational unit. In this case, the session is conducted by the department with all cadets who have such arrears.

Rating Assessment System for Academic Performance of a Cadet (Trainee, Adjunct, Student) in an Academic Discipline under the Extramural (Part-time) Form of Education

3.15. For the extramural (part-time) form of study, the application of the Rating Assessment System (RAS) takes into account the limitations in conducting intra-semester control for the students. Despite this, the assessment of extramural students is carried out using the 100-point scale.

The rating grade for the module (**R**), for extramural study with semester control in the form of a credit or an exam is formed as the sum of the module rating score (sum of current academic progress points – starting rating) – **R starting rating and the module rating score for the credit (exam) (examination points) – R credit (R exam)**.

The Rating Assessment System for the academic performance of extramural cadets (trainees, adjuncts, students) for a module (academic discipline) that requires a credit or exam **may be as follows, for example:**

Table 2

Distribution of Credit Module Points

Current Testing and Independent Work		Final Test (Exam)	Total
Section 1		40	100
Topic 1	Topic 2		
30	30		

The rating grade for the credit module (R) of an extramural cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) is composed of the points they receive for:

- Three express controls during practical sessions;
- Completion of a control work (intermediate control);
- Completion of an essay;
- Completion of the control task on the credit or the answer on the exam.

System of Rating (Weight) Points and Assessment Criteria for the Semester

Work during Practical Sessions

The **Express Control** (written questioning). The maximum number of points across 3 practical sessions equals:

R practical session=3×5=15 points

The weight point for one answer is 5:

- Full completion of the practical task.....5;
- Incomplete completion of the practical task 1-4;
- Unsatisfactory completion of the task0.

Control Work on the Topic

The maximum number of points for the control work (Rcontrol work) equals 30: The weight point is 30:

- All three tasks of the variant are fully completed 30;
- One task of the variant is fully completed 10;
- One task of the variant is not fully completed 1 – 9;
- No task of the variant is completed 0.

Completion of an Essay or other Individual Assignment

The maximum number of points for completing an essay is 15: The weight point is 15:

- Individual assignment fully completed, textual part adheres to current normative and technical documentation, sufficient quantity of modern domestic and foreign sources used 15;
- Individual assignment fully completed, textual part adheres to current normative and technical documentation, insufficient quantity of modern domestic and foreign sources used 12 – 14;
- Individual assignment fully completed, textual part adheres to current normative and technical documentation, but contains some errors, insufficient quantity of modern domestic and foreign sources used 8 – 11;
- Individual assignment not fully completed, textual part adheres to current normative and technical documentation, sufficient quantity of modern domestic and foreign sources used 5 – 8;
- Individual assignment not fully completed, textual part adheres to current normative and technical documentation, but contains some errors, insufficient quantity of modern domestic and foreign sources used 1 – 5;
- Individual assignment not completed0.

Penal and Incentive Points

The sum of penal and incentive points must not exceed 0.1R (6 points):

- Late completion of an individual assignment or modular control work (without a valid reason) -1 to -6 points;
- Participation in the modernization, support, and administration of software deployed at the department, completion of tasks to improve the department's educational and material base +1 to +6 points.

System of Rating (Weight) Points and Assessment Criteria for the Credit (Exam)

The maximum number of points for the credit (R credit) (exam (R exam)) equals 40:

- Full answer to two theoretical questions and correctly solving the practical problem of the control task (ticket) in full 40;
- Full answer to two theoretical questions of the control task (ticket) 20;
- Full answer to one theoretical question of the control task (ticket) 10;
- The practical problem of the control task (ticket) is correctly and fully solved ... 20;
- Incomplete answer to the theoretical question of the control task (ticket) 5 – 9;
- The practical problem of the control task (ticket) is not fully solved 10 – 19;
- The answer to the theoretical question of the control task (ticket) contains gross errors..... 1 – 4;
- The solution to the practical problem of the control task (ticket) contains gross errors..... 1 – 9;
- Absence of an answer to the theoretical question of the control task (ticket) 0;
- Absence of a solution to the practical problem of the control task (ticket)0.

Calculation of the Rating Score Scale (in points) for the Credit Module

The semester rating score for the academic discipline is composed of:

$$\mathbf{R_{semester} = R_{practical\ session} + R_{control\ work} + R_{completion\ of\ essay} = 15 + 30 + 15 = 60\ points}$$

The rating score for the academic discipline for the credit (exam) equals 40% of the total $R_{semester}$:

$$R_{C(E)} = R_S \frac{0,4}{1 - 0,4} = 60 \times 0,67 = 40\ points.$$

Thus, the **rating grade for the academic discipline (R)** is:

$$\mathbf{R = R_{practical\ session} + R_{control\ work} + R_{completion\ of\ essay} + R_{exam\ (R\ credit)} \pm R_{penal\ and\ incentive\ points}}$$

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the rating grade (in points) for the credit module (R) is converted according to Table 1.

Procedure for Applying the Rating Assessment System

3.16. The Rating Assessment System for academic performance in the academic discipline is communicated to extramural education applicants at the first session.

The semester rating score (total points) for the academic discipline accumulated by the extramural cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) ($R_{semester}$) is reported by the instructor during the training session on the eve of the exam and is entered into the Academic Progress Statement and the session attendance journal for the study group.

After assessing the extramural cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) based on the results of the control task (credit) or the answer on the exam, the academic-pedagogical staff member determines the rating score **R credit (R exam)**.

The rating grade (in points) for the academic discipline (R) is determined as the sum of the rating score for the academic discipline accumulated by the extramural cadet (trainee, adjunct, student) during the semester (R semester) and the rating score based on the results of completing the control task (credit) or the answer on the exam **R credit (R exam)**.

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the rating grade (in points) for the academic discipline (R) is converted according to Table 1. The academic-pedagogical staff member enters the obtained results into the Academic Progress Statement and the study group's academic progress journal.

Retaking a credit (exam) is conducted according to a separate schedule.

Organizational and methodological guidelines for conducting the credit (exam), requirements for assessing the knowledge, skills, and habits of cadets (trainees, adjuncts, students), the procedure for appealing the results of control measures and their retaking, etc., are defined in the programme for conducting the credit (exam), which is discussed and approved at a department meeting and approved by the Head (Chair) of the Department.

Eligibility requirements for students to sit the credit test (examination) under the part-time (distance) mode of study

3.17. The eligibility requirements for a cadet (trainee, postgraduate officer, or student) enrolled in the part-time (distance) mode of study to be admitted to the credit test (examination) are as follows:

no outstanding coursework or individual assignments (such as a term paper, essay, etc.);

the semester rating score in the academic discipline shall be not less than 35% of the total weighted score of the assessment activities conducted during the semester (**$0.35 \times R_{\text{starting rating}} = 0.35 \times 60 = 21$ points**).

A cadet (trainee, postgraduate officer, or student) enrolled in the part-time (distance) mode of study who has obtained fewer than 21 points during the semester shall not be admitted to the credit test (examination) and is required to improve his semester module rating score ($R_{\text{starting rating}}$) through the time allocated for independent study.

A cadet (trainee, postgraduate officer, or student) enrolled in the part-time (distance) mode of study who has not been admitted to the semester assessment in a module shall be required to address the reasons that led to this. Academic staff of the departments shall ensure that cadets (trainees, postgraduate officers, or students) enrolled in the part-time (distance) mode of study are provided with the opportunity to eliminate these reasons and to improve their rating score in the credit or content module.

Examples of developing the Rating System of Academic Performance (RSAP) of higher education students for the module of the educational component of a course paper (project)

3.18. **The rating assessment of the course paper (project) ®** shall normally consist of two components. The first (initial) component reflects the work of the cadet (trainee, postgraduate officer, or student) during the course design process and its outcome – the quality of the explanatory report and graphical materials

(**R** explanatory report). The second component reflects the quality of the defence of the course paper (project) (**R** defence of the course paper) by the cadet (trainee, postgraduate officer, or student).

Table 3

Distribution of points for the rating assessment of the course paper (project)

Assessment Breakdown for Coursework (Project)		Total
First (Initial) Component	Second Component	100
40	60	

Grading (Weighted) system and assessment criteria

First (Initial) Component

Maximum marks (**R** explanatory note) – 40.

Weighted scores consist of the following components:

- timeliness of adherence to the coursework project schedule3–5;
- relevance and justification of adopted decisions3–12;
- accuracy in the application of analysis and calculation methods6–10;
- quality of presentation and compliance with regulatory requirements4–6;
- quality of graphic materials and compliance with Standards4–7.

Second Component

Maximum marks (**R** defence of the course paper) – 60.

Weighted scores consist of the following components:

- level of proficiency in the material6–10;
- comprehensiveness of the analysis of possible options7–15;
- degree of justification of the decisions made10–20;
- ability to defend one’s position7–15.

Calculation of the Grading Scale (in Points) for Coursework (Project)

Rating (in points) for coursework (project) (r) consists of:

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}_{\text{explanatory note}} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{defence of the course paper.}}$$

To determine the grade on an extended scale, the rating (in points) for the coursework (project) (R) is converted according to Table 1.

Prerequisites for Coursework (Project) Defence

The eligibility of a higher education student to defend the coursework (project) is determined by the decision of the department.

3.19. **The rating (R) for the credit module of the educational component “Practice,”** which includes a semester assessment in the form of a pass/fail test, is

calculated as the sum of all rating points, including: the feedback by the military unit (institution), the completeness and quality of the individual assignment, the content and quality of the reporting documents, the completeness and quality of lesson plans (lesson outlines) execution, the quality of presentations and reports, as well as any penalty or merit points.

$$R = R_{\text{feedback}} + R_{\text{individual assignment}} + R_{\text{report}} + R_{\text{plan}} + R_{\text{presentation}} \pm R_{\text{penalty or merit points}}$$

Rating (Weighted) Points System and Assessment Criteria

Feedback from the military unit (institution) on practice outcomes (R_{feedback}).

To account for the feedback of the military unit (institution) on the results of the practice, which is given according to the national grading scale, a coefficient is applied $K_B = 9$. The number of points received for the feedback is calculated as follows:

- $R_{\text{feedback}} = 5$ (grade: excellent) $\times 9$ coefficient = 45 points;
- $R_{\text{feedback}} = 4,5$ (grade: very good) $\times 9$ coefficient = 40,5 points;
- $R_{\text{feedback}} = 4$ (grade: good) $\times 9$ coefficient = 36 points;
- $R_{\text{feedback}} = 3,5$ (grade: satisfactory) $\times 9$ coefficient = 31,5 points;
- $R_{\text{feedback}} = 3$ (grade: pass) $\times 9$ coefficient = 27 points;
- $R_{\text{feedback}} = 2$ (grade: fail) $\times 9$ coefficient = 18 points.

The maximum weighted score is – 45 points.

Completeness and quality of the individual assignment execution (R_{individual assignment})

To account for the supervisor’s grade for the qualification work, which is given on the traditional (five-point) scale, a coefficient is applied $K_k = 4$. The number of points awarded for the completion is calculated as follows:

- $R_{\text{individual assignment}} = 5$ (grade: excellent) $\times 4$ coefficient = 20 points;
- $R_{\text{individual assignment}} = 4,5$ (grade: very good) $\times 4$ coefficient = 18 points;
- $R_{\text{individual assignment}} = 4$ (grade: good) $\times 4$ coefficient = 16 points;
- $R_{\text{individual assignment}} = 3,5$ (grade: satisfactory) $\times 4$ coefficient = 14 points;
- $R_{\text{individual assignment}} = 3$ (grade: pass) $\times 4$ coefficient = 12 points;
- $R_{\text{individual assignment}} = 2$ (grade: fail) $\times 4$ coefficient = 8 points.

The maximum weighted score is – 20 points.

Content and Quality of Report Documentation (R_{report}).

The maximum score for the content and quality of the personal report and documentation is:

$$R_{\text{report}} = 1 \times 10 = 10 \text{ points.}$$

Weighted score – 10 points:

- the report and practice log, as well as any additional materials (if required), have been properly, fully, and timely completed10;
- but – the report and practice log, as well as any additional materials (if required), have been poorly, fully and timely, completed6–9;
- the report and practice log, as well as any additional materials (if required), have been poorly and incompletely, yet timely, completed4–5;

– the report and practice log, as well as any additional materials (if required), have been poorly, incompletely, and untimely completed1–3.

Completeness and quality of preparation of session plans (session outlines)
(**R_{plan}**).

The maximum number of points awarded for the thoroughness and quality of session plan (session outline) execution is:

$$\mathbf{R_{plan} = 1 \times 5 = 5 \text{ points.}}$$

Weighted score – 5 points:

– the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been duly, fully, and timely completed5;

– the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been inadequately, but fully and timely completed4–3;

– the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been inadequately and incompletely prepared, though submitted on time3–2;

– the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been inadequately, incompletely, and submitted late1.

The quality of presentations and reports (**R_{presentation}**).

The maximum number of points awarded for the thoroughness and quality of the report and presentation materials is:

$$\mathbf{R_{presentation} = 1 \times 20 = 20 \text{ points.}}$$

Weighted score – 20 points:

– the outcomes of the practice have been comprehensively and accurately reported, with an analysis of both positive and negative factors, and appropriate conclusions have been made20;

– the outcomes of the practice have been reported adequately but incompletely, with an analysis of both positive and negative factors, and conclusions have been made14–19;

– the outcomes of the practice have been inadequately and incompletely reported, with an analysis of both positive and negative factors conducted, yet no conclusions or recommendations for enhancing the quality of military internships have been provided8–13;

– the outcomes of the practice have been inadequately and incompletely reported, without any analysis of positive and negative factors, and no appropriate conclusions or recommendations have been provided1–7.

Penalty or merit points (**R_{penalty or merit points}**) (the sum of penalty and merit points shall not exceed 0,1R_C (10 points):

– remarks from superiors for non-compliance with safety requirements–5;

– remarks from superiors for non-compliance with disciplinary standards–5.

– participation in the modernization, support, and administration of software in the unit (institution), as well as the performance of tasks related to the improvement of the material infrastructure, with written confirmation required (implementation act or equivalent)+1 - +10.

Calculation of the rating evaluation scale (in points) for the academic subject “Practice”

3.20. The rating assessment (in points) for the educational component «Practice» (R) is composed of:

$$\mathbf{R = R_{feedback} + R_{individual\ assignment} + R_{report} + R_{plan} + R_{presentation} \pm R_{penalty\ or\ merit\ points} = 45 + 20 + 10 + 5 + 20 = 100 \text{ points.}}$$

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the Rating (R) expressed in points for the educational component “Practice” is translated as specified in Table 1.

3.21. The rating evaluation of the credit module (R) of the educational component “Military Internship”, for which the final (semester) control is conducted in the form of a pass/fail test, is formed as the sum of all rating points for: the feedback from the military unit (institution or establishment), the completeness and quality of the performance of the individual assignment, the content and quality of the reporting documents, the completeness and quality of the execution of session plans (session outlines), the quality of the report and presentation materials, as well as penalty and merit points

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{report}} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{plan}} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{presentation}} \pm \mathbf{R}_{\text{penalty or merit points}}$$

System of rating (weighted) scores and evaluation criteria

Feedback from the military unit (institution, establishment) on the outcomes of the internship (R_{feedback})

For the purpose of incorporating the feedback provided by the military unit (institution, establishment) on the outcomes of the military internship, assessed under the traditional five-point scale, a coefficient shall be applied $K_B = 9$.

The points awarded for the feedback are:

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} = 5 \text{ (grade: excellent)} \times 9 \text{ coefficient} = 45 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} = 4,5 \text{ (grade: very good)} \times 9 \text{ coefficient} = 40,5 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} = 4 \text{ (grade: good)} \times 9 \text{ coefficient} = 36 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} = 3,5 \text{ (grade: satisfactory)} \times 9 \text{ coefficient} = 31,5 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} = 3 \text{ (grade: pass)} \times 9 \text{ coefficient} = 27 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{feedback}} = 2 \text{ (grade: fail)} \times 9 \text{ coefficient} = 18 \text{ points.}$$

The maximum weighted score is – 45 points.

Completeness and quality of the individual assignment execution (R_{individual assignment})

To account for the supervisor’s grade for the qualification work, which is given on the traditional (five-point) scale, a coefficient is applied. The number of points awarded for the completion is calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} = 5 \text{ (grade: excellent)} \times 4 \text{ coefficient} = 20 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} = 4,5 \text{ (grade: very good)} \times 4 \text{ coefficient} = 18 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} = 4 \text{ (grade: good)} \times 4 \text{ coefficient} = 16 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} = 3,5 \text{ (grade: satisfactory)} \times 4 \text{ coefficient} = 14 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} = 3 \text{ (grade: pass)} \times 4 \text{ coefficient} = 12 \text{ points;}$$

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{individual assignment}} = 2 \text{ (grade: fail)} \times 4 \text{ coefficient} = 8 \text{ points.}$$

The maximum weighted score is – 20 points.

Content and quality of reporting documentation (R_{report})

The maximum number of points for the content and quality of the personal report and documentation is:

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{report}} = 1 \times 10 = 10 \text{ points.}$$

The weighted score is – 10 points:

- the report, the military internship log, and any supplementary materials (if required) are properly, fully, and timely prepared10;
- report and military internship log, together with supplementary materials (if required), are complete and submitted on time, but of poor quality6–9;
- the report and the military internship log, as well as additional materials (if required), have been prepared in a poor-quality, incomplete, but timely manner4–5;
- the report and the military internship log, as well as additional materials (if required), have been prepared in a poor-quality, incomplete, and untimely manner1–3.

Completeness and quality of preparation of session plans (session outlines)**(R_{plan})**

The maximum number of points for the quality of preparation of lesson plans (lesson outlines) is:

$$R_{\text{plan}} = 1 \times 5 = 5 \text{ points.}$$

Weighted score – 5 points:

- the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been duly, fully, and timely completed5;
- the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been inadequately, but fully and timely completed4–3;
- the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been inadequately and incompletely prepared, though submitted on time3–2;
- the session plans, together with any supplementary materials (if necessary), have been inadequately, incompletely, and submitted late1.

The quality of presentations and reports (R_{presentation}).

The maximum number of points awarded for the thoroughness and quality of the report and presentation materials is:

$$R_{\text{presentation}} = 1 \times 20 = 20 \text{ points.}$$

Weighted score – 20 points:

- the results of the practical training have been presented accurately and comprehensively, with an analysis of positive and negative factors conducted, and conclusions drawn20;
- the results of the practical training have been presented with quality but not comprehensively, an analysis of positive and negative factors has been conducted, and conclusions have been drawn14–19;
- the results of the practical training have been presented inadequately and incompletely, an analysis of positive and negative factors has been conducted, but no conclusions or recommendations for improving the quality of military internship have been provided8–13;
- the results of the practical training have been presented poorly and incompletely; no analysis of positive and negative factors has been conducted, and no corresponding conclusions or recommendations have been made1–7;

Penalty and merit points (R_{penalty or merit points}) (the total of both penalty and merit points must not exceed 0,1R_C (10 points):

- remarks from superiors for breaches of safety regulations– 5;
- remarks from superiors for breaches of discipline– 5;
- participation in the modernization, support, and administration of software within the unit (institution), as well as execution of tasks aimed at improving the material base, provided there is written confirmation (implementation report, etc.) +1 - +10.

Calculation of the grading scale (in points) for the academic component “Military internship”

The Rating (R), expressed in points for the educational component «Military internship», is composed of:

$$R = R_{\text{feedback}} + R_{\text{individual assignment}} + R_{\text{report}} + R_{\text{plan}} + R_{\text{presentation}} \pm R_{\text{penalty or merit points}} = 45 + 20 + 10 + 5 + 20 = 100 \text{ points.}$$

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the Rating (R) expressed in points for the educational component “Military internship” is translated as specified in Table 1.

3.22. Within the certification procedure, the performance in the defence of the qualification work and the comprehensive examination is evaluated on a 100-point scale, followed by conversion into grades on the extended scale, as required for the diploma supplement in the European format.

For the purpose of determining the assessment of knowledge during the defence of qualification works, methodological guidelines on the defence procedure are developed. These guidelines include, as one of their sections, unified requirements for assessing the knowledge, skills, and competences of higher education candidates, the criteria for evaluating the qualification work, and related provisions, taking into account the Rating System of Assessment (RSA).

The Rating score for the qualification work (R) normally consists of two components. The first component reflects the candidate’s work on the qualification project and its outcome – the quality of the qualification work (including the explanatory report, graphical materials, illustrative materials, etc.) – denoted as **R** quality of qualification work. The second component reflects the quality of the defence of the qualification work by the higher education candidate – denoted as **R** defence of qualification work.

The rating score for the qualification work (R) is determined as the sum of the rating score for the quality of the qualification work (R – quality of qualification work) and the rating score for the quality of its defence (R – defence of qualification work).

$$R = R_{\text{quality of qualification work}} + R_{\text{defence of qualification work}}$$

An example of the Rating System of Assessment (RSA) for the qualification work of higher education candidates may be as follows:

Table 4

Distribution of points within the rating score for the attestation work

Distribution of points for the attestation work		Total
First component	Second component	100
60	40	

When determining the rating score for the qualification work (R), the higher education student’s total points are taken into account, which are awarded for:

- practical relevance of the work;
- justification of the research objective and depth of analysis of the current state of problem-solving;
- justification of the choice of research method;
- depth of theoretical justification of the research and modeling of objects
- level of use of computers;
- level of conducting a physical (or practical) experiment;
- scientific novelty of the work;
- quality of presentation of the qualification work;
- quality of illustrative materials;
- implementation of the work's materials;
- supervisor's assessment of the qualification work;
- reviewer's assessment of the qualification work;
- defense of the qualification work at the meeting of the subcommittee of the EC.

System of rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria

The rating score for the quality of the qualification work ($R_{\text{quality of qualification work}}$) takes into account:

Practical relevance of the work

Maximum score ($R_{\text{practical relevance}}$) – 5.

Weighted points are composed of:

- the work was carried out upon the institution's request. The task (initial data) was approved by the research sponsor5;
- the work was carried out in the interest of the department's educational process4;
- the work was carried out based on actual (real) initial data3;
- the work is of a purely educational nature2.

Justification of the research objective and the depth of analysis of the current state of problem-solving.

Maximum score ($R_{\text{justification of the research objective}}$) – 5.

Weighted points consist of:

- the research objective is relevant and well-justified. The analysis of the problem's current state is based on the latest domestic and foreign sources5;
- the research objective is relevant but insufficiently justified. The analysis of the problem's current state is mainly based on domestic sources, without using periodical scientific and technical publications4;
- the requirements for scores of '5' and '4' have been partially met3;
- the research objective and tasks are not justified. The analysis of the problem's current state is mainly based on educational literature and outdated sources (over 10 years old)2.

Justification of the choice of research method

Maximum score ($R_{\text{justification of the research method}}$) – 5.

Weighted points consist of:

- the possible research methods have been examined thoroughly across multiple criteria. The selection of theoretical and experimental research methods was made based on systems analysis approaches5;
- several possible theoretical and experimental research methods were considered. The optimal method was selected based on a single criterion4;
- the choice of research method was made based on a qualitative comparison of at least two alternatives3;
- the choice of research method was made without sufficient justification2.

Depth of theoretical justification of the research and modeling of objects

Maximum score ($R_{\text{depth of theoretical justification of the research}}$) – 5.

Weighted points consist of:

- the mathematical method for solving the research tasks was justified. The boundary and initial conditions were correctly defined. The modeling method was properly justified. An analysis of the adequacy of the developed model was conducted5;
- the choice of the mathematical research method and modeling method is correct but lacks sufficient justification. The developed model is adequate for the research object. The main assumptions are correct, but the justification is insufficient4;
- the choice of the mathematical research method and modeling method is not justified. Some assumptions are incorrect or not justified3.

Level of computer utilization

Maximum score ($R_{\text{level of computer utilization}}$) – 5.

Weighted points consist of:

- development of application and system software using an object-oriented approach has been carried out. A windowed dialog interface is implemented in the development of the application software (SW – software). The optimality of the developed software has been justified based on the most important criterion5;
- the development of software systems for database design; interfaces and interaction schemes of software tools; mathematical, linguistic, informational, or organizational software support has been carried out. The choice of the programming system has been justified4;
- the development of individual components of mathematical, linguistic, software, informational, or organizational support for computer systems has been carried out3.

Level of conducting a physical experiment

Maximum score ($R_{\text{level of physical experiment}}$) – 5.

Weighted points consist of:

- an original experimental methodology has been developed or an original experimental setup has been created. The research was conducted at a modern technical and methodological level. A comparative analysis of theoretical and experimental results has been performed5;
- the choice of the experimental research method is sufficiently justified. The research was conducted at a modern technical and methodological level. An evaluation of the comparative analysis of theoretical and experimental results has been performed4;
- demonstrated the ability to conduct physical experimental research effectively. The results have been analyzed and conclusions drawn3;
- no physical experiment was conducted2.

Scientific novelty of the work

Maximum score ($R_{\text{scientific novelty of the work}}$) – 9.

Weighted points consist of:

- the work incorporates original ideas proposed personally by the master's student (as confirmed by the supervisor). A thorough analysis of the scientific and technical results has been conducted in terms of reliability, scientific significance, and practical value9;
- the research was carried out based on established approaches, but a final solution to the stated problem was achieved. An evaluation of the obtained results was conducted regarding their potential application in scientific and practical activities4–8;
- the work demonstrates the ability to conduct scientific research under supervision and to draw correct conclusions1–3.

Quality of the certification paper presentation

Maximum score ($R_{\text{work presentation}}$) – 3.

Weighted points consist of:

- the qualification paper is written in Ukrainian. The material is presented clearly, concisely and precisely. The formatting of the paper fully complies with the requirements for research reports. The text, all illustrations and tables are prepared using an office software package such as MS Office3;
- the material is presented clearly and concisely, but there are minor stylistic inaccuracies. The text has been prepared using Word for Windows. The formatting shows slight deviations from the requirements of the national standard2;
- the material is presented unclearly and contains grammatical errors. The formatting does not comply with the requirements of the national standard1.

Quality of illustrative material**Maximum score ($R_{\text{quality of illustrative material}}$) – 3.****Weighted points consist of:**

- the illustrative material fully presents, with high clarity, the key points of the thesis submitted for defence. The material has been prepared using modern graphic software packages, in full compliance with the requirements of the national standard 3;
- the illustrative material addresses the essential aspects of the thesis, but lacks sufficient visual clarity. It was developed using contemporary graphic packages, showing slight non-compliance with the standard requirements2;
- the illustrative material only partially reflects the key points of the thesis and demonstrates limited clarity. Minor deviations from standard requirements are observed1.

Implementation of the work materials**Maximum score ($R_{\text{quality of illustrative material}}$) – 5.****Weighted points consist of:**

- one of the following conditions has been met: a patent of Ukraine has been granted for an invention, industrial design, or utility model, or a positive decision has been issued; the results of the work have been implemented or approved for implementation according to the relevant official acts; an article has been published in a scientific journal; the results of the work have been adopted for use in the educational process 5;
- one of the following conditions has been met: an application has been filed for a Ukrainian patent for an invention, industrial design, utility model, or other industrial property object; know-how has been presented along with a proposal; a report has been delivered at a scientific conference, and the conference abstract is available; a certificate for a rationalization proposal has been issued3 – 4;
- recommendation of the scientific supervisor regarding the implementation or publication of the results 1 – 2.

Supervisor's evaluation of the qualification work**Maximum score ($R_{\text{supervisor's evaluation}}$) – 5.****Reviewer's evaluation of the qualification work****Maximum score ($R_{\text{reviewer's evaluation}}$) – 5.**

The rating score for the quality of the qualification work defence ($R_{\text{quality of the qualification work defence}}$) is determined by the following criteria at the EC subcommittee:

the objective of the work has been fully achieved:

- the student has demonstrated a high level of scientific training, the ability to creatively apply acquired knowledge to solve practical tasks, and a thorough understanding of the combat capabilities and technical characteristics of weapons and military equipment in their specialty;
- the student is able to apply scientific methodology when developing complex tasks and draw correct conclusions, while justifying their decisions based on combat experience, military exercises and troop training, as well as the latest advances in science and technology;

the student delivered the report in a fully substantiated, clear, and stylistically appropriate manner, confidently and correctly answered theoretical questions, explained practical actions, structured the report logically, and defended their point of view with well-reasoned arguments;

the student demonstrates a good command of methodological skills40;

the objective of the work has not been fully achieved:

the student has demonstrated a not sufficiently high level of scientific training, is not fully able to creatively apply acquired knowledge to solve practical tasks, and does not possess a complete understanding of the combat capabilities and technical characteristics of weapons and military equipment in their specialty;

the student is not fully able to apply scientific methodology when developing complex tasks and to draw correct conclusions, nor to justify their decisions based on combat experience, military exercises and troop training, or the latest advances in science and technology;

the student did not deliver the report in a fully substantiated, clear, and concise manner, answered theoretical questions and explained practical actions with insufficient confidence and correctness, structured the report not entirely logically, and did not fully defend their point of view with reasoned arguments;

the student does not fully demonstrate command of methodological skills20–39;

the objective of the work has been partially achieved:

the student has demonstrated a weak level of scientific training, has limited ability to creatively apply acquired knowledge to solve practical tasks, and has a limited understanding of the combat capabilities and technical characteristics of weapons and military equipment in their speciality;

the student has a limited ability to apply scientific methodology when developing complex tasks and to draw correct conclusions, and when justifying their decisions, to rely on combat experience, military exercises and troop training, or the latest advances in science and technology;

the student provided a poorly substantiated, unclear, and unstructured report, failed to answer all theoretical questions correctly, weakly explained practical actions, did not structure the report logically, and did not defend their point of view with reasoned arguments;

the higher education student demonstrates a limited command of methodological skills1–19.

Calculation of the rating scale (in points) for the qualification work

The rating score (in points) for the qualification work (R) consists of:

$$R = R_{\text{practical orientation}} + R_{\text{justification of the objective}} + R_{\text{choice of research method}} + R_{\text{theoretical justification of the research}} + R_{\text{level of use of the electronic computing machine}} + R_{\text{field experiment}} + R_{\text{scientific novelty of the work}} + R_{\text{formatting of the work}} + R_{\text{illustrative materials}} + R_{\text{implementation of the work materials}} + R_{\text{supervisor's evaluation of the qualification work}} + R_{\text{reviewer's evaluation}} + R_{\text{quality of the qualification work defence}} = (5+5+5+5+5+5+9+3+3+5+5+5)+40 = 100 \text{ points.}$$

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the rating score (in points) for the qualification work (R) is converted according to Table 1.

Conditions for admission to the defence of the qualification work

A student is admitted to the defence of the qualification work if the rating score (in points) prior to the defence (the sum of the rating points for the quality of the qualification work – R quality of the qualification work) is at least 21 points.

When developing the Rating Scale of Assessment (RSA) for the qualification work, the department uses (or defines) various assessment characteristics of the qualification work (relevance, novelty, originality of the obtained results, practical value, justification of the choice of research methods and

modelling of objects, level of completion of the experimental part, testing of the obtained results, quality of the explanatory note and graphical materials, etc.) and their criteria, taking into account the specifics of training, specialty, and specialization.

3.23. The comprehensive physical training examination is a means of objective control over the quality of higher education in physical training for students, which includes assessment of both physical and methodological preparedness. The level of physical training is determined through a comprehensive evaluation of the educational content, acquired professional skills and practical abilities, as well as the compliance of training with the requirements of educational-professional programmes at the corresponding levels of higher military education.

The comprehensive physical training examination includes:

assessment and evaluation of students' physical preparedness (practical performance of exercises and physical training standards);

assessment of students' methodological preparedness, which includes evaluation of knowledge of the theoretical foundations of physical training and practical performance of a methodological task.

The comprehensive physical training examination is the most objective method for determining the level at which a student has mastered the educational content. It is conducted using a control technology in the form of responses to an examination ticket, which contains theoretical questions on the fundamentals of physical training, practical questions on performing a methodological task related to organizational and command-methodical skills in conducting physical training, as well as the practical execution of exercises and physical training standards.

The technology of the comprehensive physical training examination includes the following technological stages:

creation of a system of theoretical questions, methodological tasks, and assessment of students' general and specialized physical preparedness;

design of the examination ticket;

conducting the examination;

assessment of knowledge of the theoretical foundations of physical training and practical development of organizational and command-methodical skills in conducting physical training, as well as performance of exercises and physical training standards;

assessment of the level of students' physical and methodological preparedness in accordance with objective criteria.

The rating score of the physical training examination is assigned to the cadet taking into account their gender, age group, and category of military personnel.

Assessment of cadets' physical readiness is conducted through the practical performance of control exercises and is evaluated on a point-based scale in accordance with the Physical Training Instruction of the Ministry of Defence of Ukraine.

During the assessment of theoretical knowledge, each cadet answers one question. The assessment is conducted either orally or in writing. Additional questions on the designated topics may be asked. The level of theoretical knowledge is evaluated as follows:

“excellent” – if the answer to the question is essentially correct and complete;

“good” – if the answer to the question is essentially correct but insufficiently complete or presented with minor, non-substantive errors;

“satisfactory” – if the answer to the question is generally correct but presented incompletely or with some significant errors;

“unsatisfactory” – if the answer does not address the essence of the question.

The level of organizational and methodological skills of military personnel is assessed during one day prior to the performance of practical physical training standards. The quality of performing the organizational-methodological task, which includes practical actions in organizing and/or conducting physical training, is evaluated as follows:

“excellent” – if the task is performed correctly and confidently;

“good” – if the task is performed correctly but with insufficient confidence;

“satisfactory” – if the task is performed generally correctly, but with uncertainty and minor errors;

“unsatisfactory” – if the task is not performed or is performed with uncertainty and major errors.

The assessment of the methodological proficiency of service personnel is based on the marks obtained for the response to the theoretical question and the performance of the methodological task, and is determined accordingly:

“excellent” – when both marks are rated as excellent;

“good” – when one mark is excellent and the other is Good or satisfactory; or when both marks are good;

“satisfactory” – when one mark is good and the other is satisfactory; or when both marks are satisfactory;

“unsatisfactory” – when the requirements for a satisfactory mark have not been met.

Assessment of hand-to-hand combat techniques.

The performance of hand-to-hand combat techniques shall be assessed as follows:

“excellent” – when the service member successfully defends against an enemy attack and, in doing so, performs a counterattack, executes a throw followed by a finishing strike, applies a pain compliance or demonstrates a chokehold technique, and effectively controls or neutralises the opponent;

“good” – when the technique (action) is performed continuously and technically correctly, but with insufficient speed;

“satisfactory” – when the technique (action) is performed with interruptions in fluidity or speed, or when loss of balance occurs during throws or falls, yet the intended objective is achieved;

“unsatisfactory” – when the technique (action) is not executed, performed incorrectly, or the service member fails to defend against the attack and does not conduct any counteraction.

The overall performance is calculated as follows:

1. First, the total score for the practical performance of the control exercises listed in Table 1 is determined.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (S_{CE} + S_{CE} + S_{CE} + S_{CE})$$

where S_{CE} – score for the control exercise;

$\sum_{i=1}^n$ — summation sign.

2. Next, the overall assessment is calculated, taking into account theoretical knowledge, organisational and methodological skills, and competencies as outlined in Table 1.

$$O_{\phi\pi} = \sum_{i=1}^n S_{CE} + N_{MK}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^n S_{CE}$ – total score for the practical performance of assessment exercises;

N_{MK} – assessment of theoretical knowledge, organisational and methodological skills, and competencies.

3. The overall assessment of physical training for the semester is based on scores for physical readiness and methodological preparedness, and is determined as follows:

“excellent” – if the score for physical readiness is excellent and the score for methodological preparedness is at least ‘good’;

“good” – if the score for physical readiness is good and the score for methodological preparedness is at least ‘satisfactory’;

“satisfactory” – if the score for physical readiness is ‘satisfactory’ and the score for methodological preparedness is at least ‘satisfactory’;

“unsatisfactory” – if the conditions for a ‘satisfactory’ rating are not met.

5	Participation in competitions	City and regional championships – 2 points; MoD Ukraine Military HEI Championship – 5 points; AFU Championship – 5 points; Ukrainian Championship – 5 points
6	Completion of the set of assessment exercises with a total score exceeding the “excellent” grade in physical fitness	Over 10% – 1 point; Over 20% – 2 points; Over 25% – 3 points
7	Completion of the training programme for the current semester	Average grade good – 3 points; Average grade excellent – 5 points

Correspondence (ratio) of the evaluation criteria for the overall rating of the examination (assessment) in physical education and special physical training, based on the total points from four or five exercises, to a 100-point grade, taking into account the cadet’s year of study, category, and the grade for methodological preparedness.

Table 7

Grade		Total points from 5 exercises					Total points from 4 exercises				
National scale	Points (rating points)	1 st year 2 nd cat	1 st year 1 st cat 2 nd year 2 nd cat	2 nd year 1 st cat 3 ^d year 2 nd cat	3 ^d year 1 st cat 4 th year 2 nd cat	4 th year 1 st cat	1 st year 2 nd cat	1 st year 1 st cat 2 nd year 2 nd cat	2 nd year 1 st cat 3 ^d year 2 nd cat	3 ^d year 1 st cat 4 th year 2 nd cat	4 th year 1 st cat
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
excellent	100	440	465	490	515	540	365	385	400	425	440
	99	435	460	485	510	535	360	380	395	420	435
	98	430	455	480	505	530	355	375	390	415	430
	97	425	450	475	500	525	350	370	385	410	425
	96	420	445	470	495	520	345	365	380	405	420
	95	415	440	465	490	515	340	360	375	400	415
	94	410	435	460	485	510	335	355	370	395	410
	93	405	430	455	480	505	330	350	365	390	405
	92	400	425	450	475	500	325	345	360	385	400
91	395	420	445	470	495	320	340	355	380	395	
90	390	415	440	465	490	310	330	350	370	390	
very good	89	388	413	438	463	488	308	328	348	368	388
	88	386	411	436	461	486	306	326	346	366	386
	87	384	409	434	459	484	304	324	344	364	384
	86	382	407	432	457	482	302	322	342	362	382
	85	380	405	430	455	480	301	320	340	360	380
	84	378	403	428	453	478	300	319	339	359	379
	83	376	401	426	451	476	299	318	338	358	378
	82	374	399	424	449	474	298	317	337	357	377
	81	372	397	422	447	472	297	316	336	356	376
80	370	395	420	445	470	296	315	335	355	375	
good	79	369	394	419	444	469	295	314	334	354	374
	78	368	393	418	443	468	294	313	333	353	373
	77	367	392	417	442	467	293	312	332	352	372
	76	366	391	416	441	466	292	311	331	351	371
	75	365	390	415	440	465	291	310	330	350	370

Grade		Total points from 5 exercises					Total points from 4 exercises				
National scale	Points (rating points)	1 st year 2 nd cat	1 st year 1 st cat 2 nd year 2 nd cat	2 nd year 1 st cat 3 rd year 2 nd cat	3 rd year 1 st cat 4 th year 2 nd cat	4 th year 1 st cat	1 st year 2 nd cat	1 st year 1 st cat 2 nd year 2 nd cat	2 nd year 1 st cat 3 rd year 2 nd cat	3 rd year 1 st cat 4 th year 2 nd cat	4 th year 1 st cat
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	74	364	389	414	439	464	290	309	329	349	369
	73	363	388	413	438	463	289	308	328	348	368
	72	362	387	412	437	462	288	307	327	347	367
	71	361	386	411	436	461	287	306	326	346	366
	70	360	385	410	435	460	286	305	325	345	365
	69	359	384	409	434	459	284	304	324	344	364
	68	358	383	408	433	458	283	303	323	343	363
	67	357	382	407	432	457	282	302	322	342	362
	66	356	381	406	431	456	281	301	321	341	361
65	355	380	405	430	455	280	300	320	340	360	
satisfactory	64	352	377	402	427	452	278	298	318	338	358
	63	349	374	399	424	449	276	296	316	336	356
	62	347	372	397	422	447	274	294	314	334	354
	60	345	370	395	420	445	272	292	312	332	352
	59	343	368	393	418	443	270	290	310	330	350
	58	341	366	391	416	441	268	288	308	328	348
	57	339	364	389	414	439	267	287	307	327	347
	56	337	362	387	412	437	266	286	306	326	346
55	335	360	385	410	435	265	285	305	325	345	
pass	54	333	358	383	408	433	264	284	304	324	344
	53	331	356	381	406	431	263	283	303	323	343
	52	329	354	379	404	429	262	282	302	322	342
	51	327	352	377	402	427	261	281	301	321	341
	50	325	350	375	400	425	260	280	300	320	340
unsatisfactory	49	Physical fitness assessment (National Scale): excellent; methodical training assessment: unsatisfactory									
	48	Physical fitness assessment (National Scale): very good; methodical training assessment: unsatisfactory									
	47	Physical fitness assessment (National Scale): good; methodical training assessment: unsatisfactory									
	46	Physical fitness assessment (National Scale): satisfactory; methodical training assessment: unsatisfactory									
	45	Physical fitness assessment (National Scale): pass; methodical training assessment: unsatisfactory									
	44	Methodical training assessment: excellent; physical fitness assessment (national scale): unsatisfactory									
	43	Methodical training assessment: very good; physical fitness assessment (national scale): unsatisfactory									
	42	Methodical training assessment: Good; physical fitness assessment (national scale): unsatisfactory									
	41	Methodical training assessment: satisfactory; physical fitness assessment (national scale): unsatisfactory									
	40	Methodical training assessment: pass; physical fitness assessment (national scale): unsatisfactory									
	39	256	275	294	314	334	205	220	236	251	264
	38	233	250	267	286	303	186	200	214	228	240
	37	210	225	250	257	273	168	180	193	205	216
	36	186	200	223	229	242	149	160	171	182	193
	35	162	175	187	200	212	130	140	150	160	170
	34	160	165	175	190	200	125	135	145	155	165
	33	155	160	170	185	195	120	130	140	150	160
	32	150	155	165	180	190	115	125	135	145	155
	31	145	150	160	175	185	110	120	130	140	150
	30	140	145	155	170	180	105	115	125	135	145
29	135	140	150	165	175	100	110	120	130	140	

Grade		Total points from 5 exercises					Total points from 4 exercises				
National scale	Points (rating points)	1 st year 2 nd cat	1 st year 1 st cat 2 nd year 2 nd cat	2 nd year 1 st cat 3 rd year 2 nd cat	3 rd year 1 st cat 4 th year 2 nd cat	4 th year 1 st cat	1 st year 2 nd cat	1 st year 1 st cat 2 nd year 2 nd cat	2 nd year 1 st cat 3 rd year 2 nd cat	3 rd year 1 st cat 4 th year 2 nd cat	4 th year 1 st cat
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	28	130	135	145	160	170	95	105	115	125	135
	27	125	130	140	155	165	90	100	110	120	130
	26	120	125	135	150	160	85	95	105	115	125
	25	115	120	130	145	155	80	90	100	110	120
	24	110	115	125	140	150	75	85	95	105	115
	23	105	110	120	135	145	70	80	90	100	110
	22	100	105	115	130	140	65	75	85	95	105
	21	95	100	110	125	135	60	70	80	90	100
	20	90	95	105	120	130	55	65	75	85	95
	19	85	90	100	115	125	50	60	70	80	90
	18	80	85	95	110	120	45	55	65	75	85
	17	75	80	90	105	115	40	50	60	70	80
	16	70	75	85	100	110	35	45	55	65	75
	15	65	70	80	95	105	30	40	50	60	70
	14	60	65	75	90	100	25	35	45	55	65
	13	55	60	70	85	95	20	30	40	50	60
	12	50	55	65	80	90	15	25	35	45	55
	11	45	50	60	75	85	12	20	30	40	50
	10	40	45	50	70	80	10	15	25	35	45
	9	35	40	45	65	70	9	10	20	30	40
	8	30	35	40	60	60	8	8	15	25	35
	7	25	30	35	50	50	7	7	10	20	30
	6	20	25	30	40	40	6	6	8	15	25
	5	15	20	25	30	30	5	5	6	10	20
	4	10	15	20	20	20	4	4	4	5	15
	3	5	10	10	10	10	3	3	3	3	10
	2	3	5	5	5	5	2	2	2	2	5
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

The overall physical readiness (fitness) assessment, taking into account methodical training, is determined in accordance with Table 8.

Table 8

Physical fitness score	Methodical training assessment	Adjustment of overall score	Total physical fitness score
90-100	5	5	Total score not more than 100
	4	-5	Total score not less than 90
	3		89

	2		49
80-89	5	5	Total score not more than 89
	4	-5	Total score with adjustment
	3	-15	Total score with adjustment
	2		48
65-79	5	10	Total score not more than 84
	4	5	Total score not more than 79
	3	-10	Total score not less than 65
	2		47
50-64	5	10	Total score not more than 64
	4	5	Total score with adjustment
	3	0	Total score with adjustment
	2		46 (for scores 55-64) 45 (for scores 50-54)

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the rating score (in points) of the comprehensive physical fitness exam (R) is converted according to Table 1.

3.18. The foreign language exam (language testing) serves as a means of objective quality control in higher education to assess the level of development of language skills in the main types of linguistic activity (listening, speaking, reading, writing) and ensures verification of the level of knowledge acquisition by students in the academic disciplines taught by the Department of Foreign Languages.

The foreign language exam (language testing) consists of four subtests corresponding to the main types of linguistic activity, conducted in the following order: listening, speaking, reading, writing. All subtests of the foreign language exam (language testing) are administered on the same day.

The language material of the subtests of the foreign language exam (language testing) corresponds to the standardized language proficiency level SLP

2 (Functional) in accordance with VST 003.001:2024(01) ‘Linguistic Support. Levels of Language Competence’ (NATO standard STANAG 6001 Language Proficiency Levels, Edition 5 / ATrainP-5 Language Proficiency Levels, Edition A).

The set of test materials for conducting the foreign language exam (language testing) includes:

test booklets for the reading, listening, and writing subtests;

question sets for the speaking subtest;

answer sheets for reading and listening;

answer evaluation cards for writing and speaking;

answer keys for reading and listening, used during the checking of responses;

audio recording on an electronic storage device.

Testing using computer programs is permitted.

The content of the test materials is strictly confidential.

The rating score of the foreign language exam (R) consists of four components. The first component reflects the assessment of students’ proficiency in listening – $R_{\text{listening}}$; the second component covers speaking – R_{speaking} ; the third component corresponds to reading – R_{reading} ; the fourth component relates to writing – R_{writing} .

The rating score of the foreign language exam (R) is determined as the sum of the rating points from the assessment of listening ($R_{\text{listening}}$), speaking (R_{speaking}), reading (R_{reading}), and writing (R_{writing})

$$R = R_{\text{listening}} + R_{\text{speaking}} + R_{\text{reading}} + R_{\text{writing}}$$

The overall success rating of students in the foreign language exam is as follows:

Table 9

Distribution of scores in the foreign language exam

Distribution of scores of the comprehensive foreign language exam				Sum
Checking and assessment				
Reading	Listening	Writing	Speaking	100
25	25	25	25	

System of rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria

The system of rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria takes into account the characteristics of foreign language proficiency level SLP 2 (Functional).

When determining the rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria for listening ($R_{\text{listening}}$), the following characteristics are taken into account:

the level of comprehension is sufficient to understand conversations on everyday, social, and work-related topics;

can clearly understand a native speaker who is not accustomed to speaking with non-native speakers during direct communication, provided that the speaker

uses standard language at normal speed, with a small number of repetitions and rephrasing;

- can understand utterances on a variety of clearly defined topics, such as personal and family news, social issues of a personal and general nature, everyday work matters describing people, places, or objects, as well as narratives about present, past, and future events;

- can follow the main points of discussions or conversations on topics related to their professional field;

- may not distinguish different stylistic levels, but can recognize cohesive devices and the organization of more complex speech;

- can follow a conversation of paragraph length, even if it is highly detailed;

- rarely understands words and phrases under adverse conditions (e.g., through a loudspeaker outdoors or in situations of heightened emotional tension);

- can generally understand only the overall meaning of spoken language from media sources or native speakers in situations requiring comprehension of specialized or more complex vocabulary;

- can understand the factual content of utterances;

- can comprehend facts but not the subtleties of the language.

The scoring scale for listening responses is determined taking into account the characteristics of the proficiency levels.

When determining the rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria for speaking (R_{speaking}), the following characteristics are taken into account:

- can communicate in everyday social and work situations. In these contexts, the speaker can describe people, places, and objects; talk about present, past, and future events in complete but simple paragraph-length statements; state facts; compare and contrast; give direct instructions and directions; ask predictable questions and respond to them;

- can confidently hold a conversation on most common everyday topics, such as work, family, personal information and interests, travel, and current events;

- can often engage in conversation in everyday communicative situations to meet minimal personal and practical needs, e.g., can give detailed and extended directions, make unplanned route changes, and modify arrangements;

- can converse with native speakers who are not accustomed to speaking with non-native speakers, although the native speaker may initially need to adapt to certain limitations;

- can combine sentences into paragraph-length utterances;

- usually uses simple constructions and basic grammatical links correctly, while avoiding complex structures or using them inconsistently;

- can use vocabulary correctly in widely used expressions, but sometimes inappropriately or not fully suited to the situation;

errors in pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar may occasionally distort meaning. Overall, the speaker communicates appropriately to the situation, but conversational language proficiency is not always fully confident.

When determining the rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria for reading (R_{reading}), the following characteristics are taken into account:

- can read simple authentic literature on familiar topics;
- can read unambiguous, accurate, fact-based texts that may include descriptions of people, places, and objects, as well as narratives about present, past, and future events. Texts include news reports describing frequently recurring events, simple biographical information, public announcements, standard business letters, and simple technical literature intended for a broad readership;
- can read uncomplicated authentic prose on familiar topics, which is usually presented in a predictable sequence that helps the reader understand the text;
- can identify and understand the main idea and details of texts intended for a general readership and can answer questions about factual information;
- cannot directly infer meaning from the text or grasp linguistic subtleties;
- can easily read prose using typical constructions. Although the active vocabulary may be limited, the reader can use contextual information and previously acquired world knowledge to understand the text, possibly at a slower pace and with some misinterpretation;
- can summarize, extract information, and locate specific information in more complex texts related to their professional field, but not always consistently or reliably.

When determining the rating (weighted) points and assessment criteria for writing (R_{writing}), the rating (weighted) points for writing are evaluated according to the following three criteria:

- content and completeness of the response, range of vocabulary;
- grammatical accuracy (correct sentence construction; use of correct forms of parts of speech; spelling);
- style, organization, and coherence (appropriateness of the chosen style for the task, logical sequence and overall integrity of the work, structural formatting of the work, e.g., date, salutation and closing phrases).

Level characteristics:

- can conduct personal and everyday work correspondence and write relevant documents, such as service notes, short reports, and private letters on everyday topics;
- can present facts; give instructions; describe people, places, and objects; and narrate present, past, and future events in complete but simple paragraph-length statements;
- can combine sentences into coherent text. Paragraphs are linked and contrasted using appropriate cohesive devices in reports and correspondence;
- can express thoughts approximately according to main points or as a direct sequence of events. However, connections between different ideas may not be entirely clear, and transitions from one idea to another may be insufficiently smooth;
- writing can be understood by a native speaker unaccustomed to texts written by non-native speakers;
- usually uses simple grammatical constructions correctly, but more complex constructions are either used incorrectly or avoided;

can use commonly used vocabulary, with some more complex words replaced by simpler alternatives or explained;

errors in grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation may occasionally distort meaning. The writer communicates appropriately to the situation but not always confidently.

To determine the grade on the extended scale, the rating score (in points) of the foreign language exam (R) is converted according to Table 1.

3.19. Rating system for assessing the academic performance of students in the subjects of the Department of Fire Training for full-time education.

The rating score of an academic subject ($R_{\text{rating score of the subject}}$), for which a final assessment in the form of a credit (exam) is provided, is calculated as the sum of all rating points earned from responses in group classes, completion of practical tasks, ongoing assessments, and other activities ($R_{\text{rating points for group session (GS)}}$, $R_{\text{rating points for practical session (PS)}}$, $R_{\text{rating points for ongoing assessment (OA)}}$), as well as incentive/penalty points ($R_{\text{incentive/penalty points}}$):

$$R_{\text{rating score of the academic subject}} = R_{\text{rating points for group session}} + R_{\text{rating points for practical session}} \pm R_{\text{incentive/penalty points}} + R_{\text{rating points for final assessment}}$$

The current rating score (R) of a student in an academic subject consists of points earned for:

- responses in group classes;
- completion of practical tasks;
- incentive and penalty points;
- completion of final assessment tasks;
- incentive and penalty points.

Procedure for awarding points and conducting assessment.

The rating score of an academic subject, used to assess the quality of learning outcomes, is determined in accordance with the Order No. 160 of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Ukraine dated 17.04.2018, clause 3.1.2. The maximum number of points a student can earn is 100, of which 65% (100×0.65) can be obtained from passing the credit (exam), and 35% (100×0.35) is based on the results of academic performance during the study period.

The rating score (in points) of an academic subject is calculated from the total points earned during the study period (ongoing assessment) and the score obtained by the student on passing the credit (exam), using the corresponding weighting coefficients:

$$R = R_{sp} + R_e, \text{ where:}$$

R – rating score of the academic subject;

R_{sp} – points for the study period (ongoing assessment);

R_e – points for the credit (exam).

Бали за навчальний період з навчальної дисципліни нараховуються:

$$R_{SP} = (R_{GS} + R_{PS} \pm R_{IP}) * 0,35 = (30 + 60 \pm 10) * 0,35 = 100 * 0,35 = 35 \text{ points, where:}$$

Rsp – points for the study period;

Rgs – points for group session;

Rps – points for practical session;

Rip – incentive and penalty points;

0.35 – weighting coefficient for points earned during the study period.

Points for the credit (exam) in the academic subject are awarded as follows:

$Re = (\Sigma 1 \text{ question} + \Sigma 2 \text{ question} + \Sigma 3 \text{ question} + \Sigma 4 \text{ question}) * 0,65 = (30 + 20 + 10 + 40) * 0,65 = 65$ points, where:

$\Sigma 1$ question – total points for Question 1 of the ticket;

$\Sigma 2$ question – total points for Question 2 of the ticket;

$\Sigma 3$ question – total points for Question 3 of the ticket;

$\Sigma 4$ question – total points for Question 4 of the ticket;

0,65 – weighting coefficient for points for the credit (exam).

4. Determination and publication of the overall student rating

4.1. Monitoring the quality of educational activities of students at the Academy is carried out through annual rating assessment of students' academic performance based on the results of work completed during the reporting academic year.

4.2. The student rating of an academic group (course) is a comprehensive indicator of their learning quality, which reflects not only the quality of knowledge and skills acquired in individual educational components, but also their engagement, creativity, and independence in acquiring knowledge at a given stage.

The results of the rating assessment of students in an academic group (course) are reviewed at a meeting of the faculty academic council and are published within the cadet units.

5. Final provisions

5.1. The provisions are approved by the Academic Council of the Academy and come into effect by order of the Commandant of the Academy.

5.2. Amendments and additions to the provisions are reviewed and approved by the Academic Council of the Academy and come into effect by order of the Commandant of the Academy.

Deputy commandant of the Academy for academic affairs
colonel

Oleh MASLIY

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ year

MILITARY ACADEMY (Odesa)

Faculty of training of specialists of the
Airborne Assault Forces and Marines

APPROVED

Commandant of the Academy

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ year

INDIVIDUAL EXAMINATION SCHEDULE
(Graded assessments)

prepared by cadet Prokopchuk O.S.

Year of study: 3 Training group: 183

Semester: 5 Academic year: 20__–20__

No.	Title of the academic discipline	Form of semester assessment	Date and place of examination	Teacher's Surname
1	Tactics of airborne assault units	examination	20.06.20__ 11.00–12.00 Class 120	Colonel Klymenko V.
2	Physical education and specialized physical training	differentiated credit	23.06.20__ 11.00–12.00 Sports facility of military garrison No. 17	Lieutenant Colonel Polozenko D.

The basis for preparing an individual schedule for exams (credits) is a cadet's report (or a report from a cadet in the correspondence form of study) submitted through the chain of command, which specifies the reason, the type of final (semester) assessment for the academic subject, as well as the date, location, and the instructor's surname. The report must be approved by the instructor conducting the exam or credit.

A copy of the individual schedule for exams (credits) is submitted to the Academic Department and the relevant faculty (instructor). A performance sheet is prepared for the conduct of the assessment. In the event that a cadet (or a cadet in the correspondence form of study) receives a "fail" grade, an individual schedule for retaking the exams (credits) is drawn up.

Acknowledged by:

cadet _____ Prokopchuk O.S.

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ year

ENDORSED

Deputy commandant of the Academy for
academic affairs

colonel

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ year

ENDORSED

Head of the faculty

colonel

“ ___ ” _____ 20__ year