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Suggested categories of evaluation according to the reviewer’s opinion written in a few sentences: 50..62: pass (2); 63..75: satisfactory (3); 76..88: good (4); 89..100: excellent (5).

|  |
| --- |
| **Reviewer’s evaluation (written in a few sentences)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Grade suggested by the reviewer:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Questions suggested by the reviewer to be answered by the candidate in the state exam.** |
| 1.:  2.: |

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

…………………………………………

Reviewer

|  |
| --- |
| **Internal supervisor’s opinion:** |
| I agree / do not agree with this review and the suggested grade.  Justification: |

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

…………………………………………

Internal supervisor