Feedback Form

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project title:** | Intensive Care support unit |
| **Sponsor:** | Kainos |
| **Academic supervisor:** | Ender Ozcan |
| **Industry supervisor (if any):** | Pedro Santos de Mendonca |
| **Bidding team number:** | 35 |

# Expression of Interest:

***(Please consider the criteria listed in the rubric for the EoI)***

|  |
| --- |
| **How well did the group respond to the original tender?** |
| (Consider motivation, understanding of the brief and context, preliminary analysis, management, style – see rubric)  EoI is structured extremely well and easy to follow. Motivation of the team is clear. The strengths of the team members and their complementary characteristics are emphasised aligned with the requirements. Excellent explanation of the project management approach and preliminary analysis (challenges are missing) and with explicit effort to show that the requirements are all covered. It is clear that the team satisfy the requirements and have both the desirbale and highly desirable skills.  Mark: 85 |
| **What else would you like to have seen in the EoI?** |
|  |
| **Mark out of 100 (see rubric for guidance): 85** |

# Pitch:

***(Please consider the criteria listed in the rubric for the pitch)***

|  |
| --- |
| **How well prepared was the group?** |
| (Consider style & delivery of the pitch, materials / slides used, content of the presentation, Q&A – see rubric)  The preparation of the handouts was a nice addition to the presentation. The team attempted to heavily link the project to their expertise, but the individual competences and potential contributions did not clearly come across.  The team showed a clear view of the functional role of the elements composing the system. The approach appeared modular as the result of a composition of ready modules.  So aspects of the procedure were not totally clear. |

|  |
| --- |
| **What could the team do differently another time?** |
| The talk was dominated by one person and the individual potential contributions did not come across too clearly. One member of the team sat throughout the presentation and missed to interact with the audience. |
| **Mark out of 100 (see rubric for guidance): 60** |