# HACKMIT
# CHINA
# 2026

## STUDENT HANDBOOK

**March 27-29 , 2026**

The Chinese Univerisity of Hong Kong, Shenzhen

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# WELCOME TO HACKMIT CHINA 2026

## A Message from the HackMIT

Welcome to HackMIT China 2026!

Over the next 36 hours, you will join outstanding high school students from across the country to turn your wildest ideas into tangible reality. Whether you're a coding expert, a hardware enthusiast, or a creative beginner full of ideas, this is your stage to unleash your passion, challenge yourself, and grow.

We believe that innovation comes from practice, and change begins with action. So dive in and enjoy this celebration of creators—write the future with your code and hardware.

Dear Participants,

We are thrilled to gather with you here at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen. As carriers of MIT's maker spirit, HackMIT is dedicated to providing the younger generation with cutting–edge experiences in technology and innovation. Here, you will confront real–world problems, collaborate with like–minded peers, and receive direct mentorship from MIT advisors.

True innovation lies not only in technological breakthroughs, but also in your observations and reflections on the world around you. Be brave in your attempts, bold in your experimentation, and enjoy every moment of the journey. We can't wait to see the amazing things you will create!

— HackMIT Organizing Committee & MIT Mentor Team

# HackMIT China 2026 Judging Team



Sanjith Udupa
HackMIT Director



Timothy Mathew
HackMIT Logistics committee head



Angelika Wang
HackMIT DevOps Head



Maya Rosoboro
HackMIT Finance Head



Shuxin Janet Guo
Past HackMIT Director



Ray Zhang
Member of the HackMIT Corporate
Relations Team



Yuqing Liu
Member of the
HackMIT DevOps team

# HackMIT China 2026 Judging Team

Dr. Frank Liu

CEO of BGI Innovation

Frank Liu is a MIT postdoctoral researcher with a background in data science. He has served as the CEO of BGI Innovation, which is the largest gene sequencing company in the world. Over the past 10 years, he has been instrumental in fostering innovation, including the establishment of the largest genomics incubator, accelerator, and venture capital fund worth 6 billion USD in China. Moreover, he is the founder and CEO of openbiobank.life and the co–founder of Desci Sino. Frank Liu is a serial entrepreneur and a seasoned veteran in biotech acceleration.

Dr. Zhou Liguang (CUHK(SZ))

PhD from the Faculty of Science and Engineering,CUHK(Shenzhen), he works at the Shenzhen Institute of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics for Society, focusing on robotics, path planning and positioning with expertise in embedded software development, and his research has been published in top international conferences like ICRA and IROS while he also devotes himself to science popularization education for teenagers.

Dr. Qu Jingru (CUHK(SZ))

An Assistant Professor (Teaching) at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, CUHK(Shenzhen) and a PhD in Education from the Education University of Hong Kong, she researches civic education, computational thinking and curriculum design, with rich teaching and research experience and numerous academic publications in international education journals.

Ziyan Lou Director of AIRS

Serving as the Director of the Shenzhen Institute of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics for Society, he is a renowned expert in STEAM innovative education with a focus on the integration and practice of STEAM education concepts.

Peisheng Zhang Technical Expert of AIRS

Holding a bachelor's and master's degree in Mechanical Engineering from Stony Brook University, he has over 10 years of experience in project management and engineering R&D, excels in cross-cultural team management and full-cycle project control, and has led the delivery of multiple key projects in mechanical system R&D and underwater equipment design with industry awards.

# HackMIT China 2026 Logistics

**HackMIT China Venue:** The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen

**Address:** 2001 Longxiang Boulevard, Longgang District, Shenzhen, Guangdong Province, China

## Transportation Guide

**Shenzhen Bao'an International Airport:** Take Metro Line 11, transfer to Line 3, and get off at "Dayun Station." Then, take a bus or taxi to the university.

**Shenzhen North Station:** Take Metro Line 5, transfer to Line 3, and get off at "Dayun Station."

## Hotel—Campus Shuttle (March 28–29):

**1. Kyriad Marvel Hotel (Baisheng Mansion Branch):** Shuttle departs promptly at <u>7:00 AM on March 28 and 29</u> (no waiting for latecomers; participants who miss the shuttle should make their own way to the campus).

**2. Kyriad Marvel Hotel (LongGan Dayun Sports Center Branch):** Shuttle departs promptly at <u>7:30 AM on March 28 and 29</u> (no waiting for latecomers; participants who miss the shuttle should make their own way to the campus).

**Daily Meeting Point:** Hotel Lobby

## Campus—Hotel Shuttle (March 27):

**1.Kyriad Marvel Hotel (Baisheng Mansion Branch):** Shuttle departs promptly at 9:10 PM on March 27 (no waiting for latecomers; participants who miss the shuttle should make their own way back to the hotel).

**2. Kyriad Marvel Hotel (LongGan Dayun Sports Center Branch):** Shuttle departs promptly at <u>9:10 PM on March 27</u> (no waiting for latecomers; participants who miss the shuttle

should make their own way back to the hotel).

**Daily Meeting Point:** East Gate of the University

# Campus—Hotel Shuttle (March 28):

1.Kyriad Marvel Hotel (Baisheng Mansion Branch): Shuttle departs promptly at 10:10 PM on March 28 (no waiting for latecomers; participants who miss the shuttle should make their own way back to the hotel).

2. Kyriad Marvel Hotel (LongGan Dayun Sports Center Branch): Shuttle departs promptly at 10:10 PM on March 28 (no waiting for latecomers; participants who miss the shuttle should make their own way back to the hotel).

**Daily Meeting Point:** East Gate of the University

## Accommodation Arrangements

### Meal Arrangements

Meals are available at the university canteens, Alipay and Wechat Pay can be used at canteens.

### Wi-Fi Access

Public Wi-Fi is available on campus. You can access it by using your mobile phone number to receive a verification code.

### Medical Services

If you feel unwell, please immediately contact a nearby volunteer or call the emergency number.

# HackMIT China Schedule&Flour Map

## HackMIT China 2026 Schedule

### March 27 (Friday)

| Time | Activity | Location |
|---|---|---|
| 14:00–19:00 | Registration | Teaching B Floor 1 |
| 19:00–20:00 | Opening Ceremony | Teaching B 201 |
| 20:00–21:00 | Hacking Begins | Teaching B 201 |

### March 28 (Saturday)

| Time | Activity | Location |
|---|---|---|
| 08:00–22:00 | Hacking | Teaching A Hacking Room |
| 10:00–15:30 | Workshop | Teaching A 107 |
| 08:00–22:00 | Faculty Lounge –Open | Teaching A 308 |
| 10:00–22:30 | HackMIT Souvenir Shop–Open | Teaching A |
| 08:00–22:00 | Organizing Committee Office – Open | Teaching A 317 |

### March 29 (Sunday)

| Time | Activity | Location |
|---|---|---|
| 08:00 | Hacking end project submission | online |

| 08:30–09:30 | Hackathon Fair | Teaching A |
| 09:20–9:30 | Roadshow Draw Session | Teaching A Road Show Room |
| 09:30–12:00 | Project Roadshow | Teaching A Road Show Room |
| 14:30–15:30 | Closing Ceremony | Teaching B 201 |
| 08:00–12:00 | Faculty Lounge –Open | Teaching A 308 |
| 10:00–14:30 | HackMIT Souvenir Shop–Open | Teaching A |
| 08:00–15:30 | Organizing Committee Office – Open | Teaching A 317 |

# Floor Map



**Hacking Room:** Teaching A 204、Teaching A 207、Teaching A 301、Teaching A 307、

Teaching A 310

**Project Roadshow and Draw  Session：**

Healthcare–**Teaching A 107**

Sustainability –**Teaching A 301**

Education–**Teaching A 207**

Entertainment–**Teaching A 307**

**Canteen：** Conference ComplexI(CxI)

**Canteen Open Time：**

Lunch：11:00–13:00，Dinner:17:00–19:00

# HackMIT China 2026 CODE OF CONDUCT

## Code of Conduct in Competition

This event aims to create a fun, safe, and inclusive environment for all participants. To ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity in a friendly atmosphere, you must adhere to the following guidelines. All participants are expected to follow these rules across all event online platforms and throughout the entire duration of the activity. Failure to comply may result in expulsion from this event and could affect eligibility for future participation. Such disqualification includes the forfeiture of project submission and award consideration.

## Competition Restrictions

Participants must meet the age requirements for participation as stipulated by local laws and regulations. To ensure fair play, projects based on prototypes are permitted, provided that the code is uploaded and a relevant project introduction is completed before the event officially begins. Prior to the start of the hackathon, the organizing committee will conduct a thorough code review. If any form of cheating is discovered, such as hiding commented code or concealing functional modules, the offending team or individual will be immediately disqualified. During the competition, participants develop and optimize their projects; only the work accomplished during the official hacking period will be eligible for award consideration. Submitting work completed by others or by a team is considered cheating and will also lead to disqualification. Only the work completed during the event will be evaluated for awards. The organizing committee reserves the right to disqualify any project for cheating methods not explicitly listed here. Specifically, making false statements about your project, whether intentional or not, constitutes cheating.

## AI Usage Guidelines

The use of AI-assisted development is permitted, but the following rules must be followed:

Transparent Declaration: Clearly state in your project documentation or PPT which

AI tools were used (such as ChatGPT, GitHub Copilot, etc.) and for what purposes.

Core Contribution: The core ideas and key decisions of the project must be made by the team members; AI is only to be used as an auxiliary tool. Judges will evaluate the team's originality.

No Complete Reliance: Submitting code that is entirely AI-generated and has not been understood or modified by the team as the final project is strictly prohibited.

Violation Handling: If a project is found to be entirely AI-generated and the team cannot explain its principles, it will be treated as cheating.

## External Guidance Instructions

On-site Mentoring: External assistance or guidance is strictly prohibited in the main working area (Hacking Room).

No Real-time Remote Assistance:During the competition, participants are not allowed to receive real-time guidance on coding or project design from external individuals (non-mentors) through communication software (WeChat, QQ, etc.).

Reference Materials Allowed:

Searching for public documentation, tutorials, and open-source code online is permitted, but direct plagiarism is prohibited.

Reporting Violations: If a team is found to be receiving external guidance in violation of the rules, reports can be made to the organizing committee. If verified, the team will be disqualified.

## Harassment

This event has a zero-tolerance policy for any form of harassment. Harassment includes, but is not limited to, offensive verbal or written comments, inappropriate behavior, and unwelcome sexual attention. This encompasses any inappropriate remarks or actions related to gender, race, age, sexual orientation, disability, ethnicity, or religion. The organizing committee has the authority to take any action they deem appropriate against any participant involved in inappropriate conduct, including issuing warnings and disqualification from the event. We are committed to providing a mutually respectful environment for everyone.

If you feel that you are being harassed, notice that someone else is being harassed, or have any other concerns, please contact a representative of the organizing committee immediately:

Email: team@hackmit.org

# HackMIT China Rules & Judging Criteria

Projects based on prototypes are permitted, provided that the code is uploaded and a relevant project introduction is completed before the event officially begins. Prior to the start of the hackathon, the organizing committee will conduct a thorough code review. If any form of cheating is discovered, such as hiding commented code or concealing functional modules, the offending team or individual will be immediately disqualified. During the competition, participants develop and optimize their projects; only the work accomplished during the official hacking period will be eligible for award consideration. Submitting work completed by others or by a team is considered cheating and will also lead to disqualification. Only the work completed during the event will be evaluated for awards. The organizing committee reserves the right to disqualify any project for cheating methods not explicitly listed here.

The HackMIT China scoring criteria is based on the 5 judging dimensions. Each dimension is divided into four levels: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Needs Improvement.

The total score is 100 points, and the weight of each dimension remains unchanged: Innovation (30%), Technical Complexity (25%), Impact (25%), Learning & Collaboration (10%), and Presentation Performance (10%).

# 1. Innovation (30 Points)

Core Evaluation: Uniqueness of the idea, innovativeness in problem-solving, and novelty of implementation methods. It aligns with the characteristics of middle school students' innovative thinking, focusing on breakthroughs in ideas and methods rather than mere technical sophistication.

| Level | Score Range | Detailed Scoring Descriptions |
|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 24–30 | 1. The idea is highly unique, focusing on practical problems in middle school campus life or daily life that have not been addressed by existing solutions, and proposing a completely new problem-solving approach.<br><br>2. An original implementation method/technology combination is adopted, which is highly adapted to the problem with no obvious traces of reference.<br><br>3. The innovation points are clear and feasible, and can bring new insights to the solution of similar problems. |
| Good | 18–23 | 1. The idea has obvious novelty, proposing an optimized and improved solution for existing problems that is different from conventional thinking.<br><br>2. The implementation method has minor innovations on the existing basis, such as the ingenious combination of technical tools or the |

| | | simplification and upgrading of processes. |
| | | 3. The innovation points are clear, reflecting the students' independent thinking. |
| Satisfactory | 12–17 | 1. The idea is basically reasonable, mainly drawing on mature existing solutions with only minor adjustments in details and no breakthrough in core ideas. |
| | | 2. The implementation method is a conventional and general one with no novelty, failing to reflect unique thinking. |
| | | 3. There is no obvious plagiarism, and the idea is in line with the competition theme. |
| Needs Improvement | 0–11 | 1. The idea has no novelty at all, directly repeating existing solutions or even copying similar works without independent design for the problem. |
| | | 2. The implementation method completely applies ready–made templates/tutorials with no independent adjustment. |
| | | 3. The idea has low relevance to the competition theme and no practical innovative value. |

## 2. Technical Complexity (25 Points)

Core Evaluation: Realization of project functions, rationality of UI/UX design, and difficulty and completion of technical implementation. Combined with the technical ability level of middle school students, it focuses on the on-site development and implementation effect rather than the absolute level of technical difficulty.

| Level | Score Range | Detailed Scoring Descriptions |
|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 20–25 | 1. The project's functions are fully realized with no obvious bugs, stable operation, and perfect alignment with design goals.<br><br>2. The UI/UX design is adapted to the target users (middle school students/relevant scenarios), with an attractive interface, smooth interaction, clear operation logic, and consideration of users' usage habits.<br><br>3. The technical selection has a certain degree of difficulty (suitable for middle school students' abilities), the implementation process is sophisticated, the code/hardware design is standardized, reflecting an in-depth understanding of technology with no obvious technical defects. |
| Good | 15–19 | 1. Core functions are fully realized with 1–2 minor non-core bugs that do not affect overall use, and the operation is basically stable.<br><br>2. The UI/UX design is simple and reasonable, |

| | | with a neat interface, basically smooth interaction and no obvious operational obstacles. <br><br> 3. The technical selection is appropriate, the implementation process is smooth, basic technical difficulties in development can be solved, and the code/hardware design is basically standardized. |
|---|---|---|
| Satisfactory | 10–14 | 1. Basic functions are realized with 3–4 bugs, some non–core functions are unfinished, there is slight lag/failure during operation, but the core process is feasible. <br><br> 2. There is a basic UI/UX design with a simple interface and a small number of unreasonable interaction points, but it can meet basic usage needs. <br><br> 3. The technical selection is entry–level conventional tools, the implementation process is average, only basic technical operations can be completed, and the ability to solve simple technical difficulties is weak. |
| Needs Improvement | 0–9 | 1. Core functions are not realized with a large number of bugs, the project cannot run normally, and even the basic development is unfinished. <br><br> 2. There is no obvious UI/UX design, with a |

| | | messy interface, no clear interaction logic, and users cannot operate normally. |
| | | 3. The technical selection is inappropriate, the implementation process is rough, the code/hardware design is non–standard, no technical difficulties are solved, and even basic technical errors exist. |

## 3. Impact (25 Points)

Core Evaluation: Importance of the problem solved by the project, practical application value, and potential for future development and implementation. It focuses on real problem–solving from the perspective of middle school students, does not require commercial value, and emphasizes adaptability to campus/life scenarios.

| Level | Score Range | Detailed Scoring Descriptions |
|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 20–25 | 1. The project focuses on prominent practical problems of middle school students/campuses/communities (such as learning efficiency, campus management, and life convenience), can effectively solve the problems and cover a certain user group. |
| | | 2. There is a clear and specific implementation plan, including the direction of subsequent optimization and steps for scenario |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | implementation, which can be directly trialed on a small scale in campuses/life.<br><br>3. It has strong expandability and can be adapted to more similar scenarios through simple upgrades, with practical application value. |
| Good | 15–19 | 1. The project addresses specific small problems in campus/life, can solve the core pain points of the problem and cover a specific niche user group.<br><br>2. There is a basic implementation idea, the applicable scenarios of the project are clear, and it has the possibility of small–scale implementation.<br><br>3. It has a certain degree of expandability and can be adapted to 1–2 similar scenarios through revision and improvement. |
| Satisfactory | 10–14 | 1. The problem solved by the project is trivial with no obvious actual demand, only able to solve minor problems in individual scenarios and cover very few users.<br><br>2. There is only an initial implementation idea with no clear implementation steps, limited implementation potential, and requiring a lot of optimization before it can be put into use. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 3. It has poor expandability and can only be applied to a single specific scenario and cannot be migrated to other scenarios. |
| Needs Improvement | 0–9 | 1. The project does not clearly solve any practical problems, has no specific application scenarios, and is disconnected from the needs of middle school students/campuses/life.<br><br>2. There is no implementation idea at all, and the project is only a conceptual design with no practical implementation possibility.<br><br>3. It has no expandability, even cannot be used normally in the designed scenarios, and has no practical application value. |

## 4. Learning & Collaboration (10 Points)

Core Evaluation: Full participation and contribution of all members and their learning gains in team projects, as well as self–breakthrough and new attempts of individuals in individual projects. It aligns with the core characteristics of hackathons — learning by doing and collaborative development, focusing on procedural growth.

| Level | Score Range | Detailed Scoring Descriptions |
|---|---|---|
| Excellent | 8–10 | Team Project: 1. All members have clear division of labor and all undertake core work in project development/roadshow with no |

|  |  | free–riding behavior.<br><br>2. Each member can clearly explain their gains in the project, including the mastery of new knowledge and skills, or the improvement of problem–solving ability.<br><br>Individual Project: 1. Boldly attempt cross–disciplinary technologies/methods (such as learning a new programming language from scratch, developing a combination of hardware and software).<br><br>2. Achieve a significant self–breakthrough, the difficulty of the work is much higher than the individual's original ability level, and can clearly summarize the learning process and gains. |
|---|---|---|
| Good | 6–7 | Team Project: 1. Most members (80% and above) undertake substantive work in the project with basically reasonable division of labor, and a small number of members undertake auxiliary work.<br><br>2. Most members can explain their learning gains and master basic new skills/knowledge.<br><br>Individual Project: 1. Attempt new technologies/methods (within the field related to their own abilities), with no cross–disciplinary attempts but obvious efforts |

| | | to try something new. |
|---|---|---|
| | | 2. Achieve a certain self–breakthrough, the difficulty of the work is slightly higher than the individual's original ability level, and can briefly summarize the learning gains. |
| Satisfactory | 4–5 | Team Project: 1. Some members (50%–79%) undertake practical work in the project with unreasonable division of labor, and some members have extremely low participation. |
| | | 2. Members who participate in the work can briefly mention learning gains without clearly elaborating on the specific knowledge/skills mastered. |
| | | Individual Project: 1. The work is completed within the individual's original ability range, with only minor attempts at new technical details and no obvious breakthroughs. |
| | | 2. Can vaguely explain learning gains without reflecting obvious ability improvement. |
| Needs Improvement | 0–3 | Team Project: 1. The project work is concentrated on a small number of 1–2 people, most members make no actual contributions and free–ride throughout the process. |
| | | 2. Members cannot explain learning gains and even do not learn any new content in the |

| | | project. |
| | | Individual Project: 1. Completely copy their own original experience/works with no new attempts at all, and no breakthroughs in technology and ideas. |
| | | 2. Cannot explain learning gains, and project development brings no ability improvement. |

# 5. Presentation Performance (10 Points)

Core Evaluation: Structural logic, expression skills, effective use of visual aids, and time management of the roadshow. It aligns with the characteristics of hackathon roadshows — time-efficient, demo-focused and communication-intensive, focusing on the judges' and audience's understanding and experience.

| Level | Score Range | Detailed Scoring Descriptions |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Excellent | 8–10 | 1. The roadshow structure is extremely clear and highly logically coherent, unfolding in the order of "Background – Problem – Solution – Implementation – Achievements – Outlook" layer by layer, allowing judges/audience to quickly understand the core of the project. |
| | | 2. The expression is fluent and natural with clear enunciation, appropriate body language, sufficient eye contact with the audience, and varied intonation, which can actively attract the |

| | | audience's attention with strong interactivity. 3. Visual aids (slides, demos, videos) are exquisitely made with prominent key points, highly consistent with the roadshow content, and the demo process is smooth without errors; time management is precise, fully in line with the allotted time with no rush or delay at all. |
|---|---|---|
| Good | 6–7 | 1. The roadshow structure is clear and relatively logically coherent with complete core links, only a little stiff transition in individual links, allowing judges/audience to understand the main content of the project. 2. The expression is relatively fluent with no obvious pauses, basic body language and eye contact, and basically steady intonation, which can attract the audience's attention. 3. Visual aids are properly made with concise content, able to support the roadshow content, and the demo process is basically smooth with only 1 minor error; time management is reasonable, with a deviation of less than 10% from the allotted time and no overtime/rush. |
| Satisfactory | 4–5 | 1. The roadshow structure is basically complete with all core links involved, but there are a small number of logical breaks and chaotic |

|  |  | explanation order of some content, requiring judges/audience to sort out actively to understand the core. |
|  |  | 2. The expression is basically clear with a small number of pauses, insufficient body language/eye contact, and flat intonation, making the audience easy to be distracted, but the core content can be clearly explained. |
|  |  | 3. Visual aids are simply made with single content, only able to display basic information, and the demo process has 2 minor errors; time management is basically qualified, with a deviation of 10%–20% from the allotted time and slight rush/overtime. |
| Needs Improvement | 0–3 | 1. The roadshow structure is messy and incoherent with missing core links and disorganized content explanation, making judges/audience unable to understand the core of the project. |
|  |  | 2. The expression is unclear with frequent pauses, no body language and eye contact at all, and stiff intonation, even with memory lapses and expression errors, making the audience unable to obtain valid information. |
|  |  | 3. No effective visual aids, or visual aids irrelevant to the content, the demo process has |

| | | frequent errors or even cannot be completed; time management is seriously unqualified, with a deviation of more than 20% from the allotted time, or serious overtime/rush that the core content cannot be finished. |
|---|---|---|

# Final Project Submission

The deadline for final project submissions for HackMIT China 2026 is: March 29, 2026, at 8:00 AM (Beijing Time).

All teams must submit their final project materials for judging via the link below before the submission deadline. The organizing committee recommends that representatives allocate an additional 20 minutes for uploading materials to avoid any technical issues, such as last–minute upload failures, which could affect the judging and road show evaluation of the team's work.

Final Project Submission Channel:



The project evaluation materials submitted by the team should include the following:

**Project Title (required) :** the finalized name of your project

1.  **1 Line Project Description (required):** Use ONE sentence to brefly describe your project. E.g.: An online document collaboration tool that is easy to use. An app that helps the elderly keep a record of their medication history.

2.  **Thumbnail Photo (recommended) :** A screenshot of your application or a poster that can help you introduce the main functions of your project.

3. **Project Essay:** A 20–150 word essay that answers to the following prompts (all are optional, but you should pick at least one you wish to answer)

- Inspiration

- What it does

- How we built it

- Individual Contributions

- Challenges we ran into

- Accomplishments that we're proud of

- What we learned

- What's next for our project

4. **Roadshow PPT(required)：** You should upload your slide for road show& presentation, the file should be in PPTX, Keynote or PDF format. File size should not exceed 50MB.

5. **Github Repository link (required) :** Link to the code for the project on github

6. **Demo Video Link (recommended):** YouTube or Bilibili link to a video demo, you should upload the demo video earlier and give time for the video platform to review and process your upload.

7. **Deployed Website (recommended) :** If the project is a deployed website, you should provide the link to the website.

# Project Roadshow Rules

1.  All participating teams must complete the project road show and Q&A session, regardless of whether they successfully submitted their project before the deadline. Teams are required to participate as scheduled and may not be absent without justification.

2.  The project road show and Q&A will be held in separate sessions according to the event's designated tracks. The presentation order for each team will be determined by an on–site draw. Each team must designate one official member to represent them in the draw, which must be completed 10 minutes before the start of the road show for their respective track. Teams that fail to participate in the draw on time will have their presentation order randomly assigned by the organizing committee. Once confirmed, the draw results may not be altered.

3.  Teams must prepare their road show presentation materials in advance and bring their own equipment for the presentation. During the road show, teams must connect their own laptops to the on–site presentation equipment. Laptops must be equipped with a standard HDMI port, or teams must bring their own compatible HDMI adapter (including adapters for various interfaces to HDMI). The venue will only provide projection/display equipment with a standard HDMI interface. No additional peripherals (such as stylus pens, presentation clickers, remote controls, etc.) will be provided. If teams require specialized peripherals, they must bring them themselves. If a team's equipment malfunctions or cannot connect to the on–site presentation equipment, they may use a public computer provided by the on–site staff to access their uploaded presentation files for their demonstration. Any resulting deviations in presentation quality, content display issues, or other related problems are solely the responsibility of the participating team. The HackMIT China Organizing Committee assumes no responsibility for any presentation performance issues arising from equipment or technical problems.

4.  All team members may participate in the road show presentation. The number of speakers, role division, and speaking order are to be decided internally by the team, with no additional restrictions imposed on–site. The total time allotted for each team's road show presentation is strictly 7 minutes. When one minute remains, the judges will provide a verbal time reminder. If a team exceeds the allotted presentation time, the judges have the right to immediately interrupt the presentation, and any remaining content will be

considered forfeited. Judges will score the team based only on the content presented. Teams must plan their time carefully to ensure they cover their core content within the specified timeframe.

5.  Immediately following the road show presentation, the team must participate in an on–site Q&A session based on questions posed by the judges. The questions will focus on the team's submitted project, their road show presentation, and their overall performance. The total duration for the Q&A session shall not exceed 3 minutes. When 30 seconds remain, the judges will provide a verbal time reminder. Once the time has elapsed, the judges have the right to terminate the Q&A session, and any unanswered questions or incomplete responses will be considered forfeited. Judges will score the team based only on the responses provided. The Q&A session should be a collaborative effort; teams may designate one primary respondent, with other members allowed to supplement the answers. Questions from the judges must be addressed directly; teams may not avoid or delay responses without justification.

6.  All teams must wait orderly in the designated waiting area for their track and maintain on–site order. Following the completion of one team's road show and Q&A session, the next team must take the stage and complete their equipment setup within 1 minute. Teams that cause undue delays may have points deducted at the discretion of the judges based on the specific situation.

# List of Hardware Provided

Elegoo Super Starter 2–4x

ELEGOO UNO R3 Super Starter Kit (4 kits)

Elegoo Sensor Kit 2–5x
37–in–1 Sensor Module Kit (5 kits)

Elegoo Ultrasonic Sensors 5px 2–5x

ELEGOO HC–SR04 Ultrasonic Sensor Module

Elegoo Jumper Wires 120pcs 3x

Jumper Wires 20cm 40–Pin (M/M, M/F, F/F) – 3

Arduino Uno in Bulk 15x

UNO R3 Development Board (15 pieces)

# CONTACT US :

**ADDRESS**
Science and Technology Park, Sun Yat-sen University, No. 135, Xingangxi Rd, Guangzhou

Tel : **+86(20)8520-8637**

Website : https://china.hackmit.org

E-mail : china@hackmit.org

Hosted by: **HackMIT**

Supported by: **High-leap Education**