Sustainable Smart Campus as a Living Lab – Expression of Interest (length limited to 2 pages)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Project name* |  |
| *Team leader(s)* |  |
| *Please briefly describe the* ***problem*** *that needs to be solved* |  |
| *Briefly describe the proposed* ***solution*** *to the problem* |  |
| *Please explain how this project meets our definition of* ***“Sustainable and Smart”*** |  |

Sustainable Smart Campus as a Living Lab – Expression of Interest

***General questions for scope and implementation***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *General Timeline*  | *Is the scope of this project achievable within 2 years?* |  |
| *Challenges* | ***What are you worried about in terms of implementation on this campus?*** |  |
| *Budget* | ***Approximately how much is needed for this project?*** |  |
| *Educational outcomes* | ***Will this project be easy or hard to explain to our community members? Do you have some thoughts on how it can be promoted, or made visible for people to learn from?***  |  |
| *Needs*  | ***Besides budget, what else would you need to ensure this project is a success? (e.g., space, permission from CMO, data, access to the Open Data Platform)?*** |  |
| *Campus*  | ***Can this project be replicated on the new Guangzhou campus?*** |  |

SSC Project Criteria Rubrics (*for project development guidance*)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **criteria** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Improvement Needed** | **Satisfactory** | **Exceptional** |
| **Project champions** | Lacking at least one full-time HKUST faculty or staff to take ownership and lead the project. | Single HKUST faculty or staff as the lead / point of contact. No cross-disciplinary collaboration.  | A dedicated team that includes people from other disciplines, with a dedicated team leader and others committed to support. | An interdisciplinary team with a diverse member set, preferably with student and/or alumni involvement; with one dedicated team leader and others committed to support. |
| **Stage of development** | Requests for seed grant, basic research, entrepreneurship. | Project ideas with reasonable opportunity for campus, but lack definition or concrete steps for implementation. | Idea is further developed with a general budget, rough outline, and implementation timeline. Shared idea with campus operations staff (CMO, etc). A demonstrable prototype or pilot has been developed. | Idea has well-defined project scope of work, line-level budget, timeline, and locations for implementation. Incorporated feedback from campus operations staff (CMO, etc). A demonstrable prototype or pilot has been developed. |
| **Visibility and Educational Potential** | Projects with zero potential for broad educational outcomes for the community; or no potential for follow-on research or knowledge transfer. | Projects that appeal only to people who specialize in the field; limited ability to showcase the technology or approach. Some data or information generated with potential for follow-on work. | Internal or external projects that appeal to more than one stakeholder group, with some visible learning opportunities identified. Identification of KPIs and data potential for future follow-on projects.  | “Home-grown” projects that are designed to engage multiple stakeholder groups and have potential for high visibility within the campus. Identification of KPIs and data potential for future follow-on projects, with specifics carved-out for student hands-on projects like UROP/USEL or service learning experiences. |
| **Sustainable and Smart** | Projects that cannot satisfy definitions. | Projects that have marginal smart or sustainable benefits, but not combined. | Projects that can demonstrate positive sustainable and smart elements. | Projects that satisfy the definitions in ways that provide a clear demonstration of how the approach is a model for the vision, and would be a clear source of inspiration and pride for the HKUST community  |
| **Value for money** | Projects that cannot demonstrate a positive value for money proposition; top heavy with staffing costs. | Value for money and cost benefit analysis included, but weak. Too much heavily weighted on staffing expenses. | Positive value for money in life-cycle CBA, clearly defined end-of-life strategy (plan for hand-over). Staffing expenses are reasonable and justifiable. | Positive value for money in life-cycle CBA, clearly defined end-of-life strategy with salvage / recycling plan; clear and accepted roles for admin staff for hand-over. Staffing expenses are reasonable and justifiable. |