



# AUBEA Awards 2026

## Research Awards

### Instructions

#### **Purpose**

The AUBEA Research Awards recognise outstanding individuals and teams in construction management and related built environment disciplines who have demonstrated sustained excellence in research, innovation, and industry engagement, with a demonstrable impact on industries and communities.

#### **Categories**

Awards are available in the following categories:

- Research Excellence
  - Early Career (Individual): up to 5 years since PhD completion
  - Mid-Career (Individual): 5 - 15 years since PhD completion
- Research Impact (Individual or Team). For team nominations, each member must have been an active contributor for at least two years with a minimum 10% contribution.

#### **General Eligibility Criteria**

- Nominations may be submitted by the nominee or by a nominator. Nominees must be employed by, or hold a formal academic appointment at, an AUBEA member institution and be actively engaged in research in construction management or related built environment disciplines at the time of nomination and award presentation. For the Research Impact Award, the lead applicant must be based at an AUBEA member institution; team members may be from other institutions.
- Where applicable, nominations must include endorsement from the nominee's Head of School, Department, or equivalent.
- Contributions must relate to research, including research grant income, research outputs, higher degree research and research leadership.
- Unless otherwise stated, evidence presented should normally relate to achievements within the preceding five years, while allowing reference to earlier foundational work where relevant.
- The same body of work may not be submitted simultaneously for multiple award categories unless explicitly permitted.
- All claims made in nominations must be supported by verifiable evidence where possible (e.g., citations, funding records, impact statements, testimonials).
- For the Research Impact Award, each team member must have been an active contributor to the team's work for at least two years, with a substantial contribution (normally 10% or greater) to the achievements described in the nomination.
- AUBEA encourages nominations that reflect the diversity of the construction management and built environment research community.
- Career interruptions (e.g., parental leave, illness) will be considered when assessing eligibility for Early Career and Mid-Career applicants.
- Previous winners are ineligible for nomination in the award round immediately following their win. Re-nomination in later years is permitted only where the contribution under consideration is substantially different from that previously recognised.

- Staff who resign, retire, or otherwise leave an AUBEA member institution before the award ceremony are normally ineligible. If circumstances change after submission (e.g., resignation, retirement, or change of institution), eligibility will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Assessment Panel.
- Staff moving to another AUBEA member institution may remain eligible, provided their contributions under consideration were made at an AUBEA member institution.
- Nominees on approved secondments, sabbaticals, or temporary leave (e.g., industry placements, parental leave) remain eligible, provided they maintain an active appointment with an AUBEA member institution.
- The lead applicant (or individual nominee) must be registered for the AUBEA Annual Conference to be eligible to receive an award.

## **A1: Early-Career Research Excellence Award**

### **Application Guide**

- Nominations are assessed against all three criteria.
- Applicants must address all criteria. However, it is expected that nominees will demonstrate greater strength in some areas than others.
- For Early Career nominees, assessors will take career stage into account and depth of evidence in at least two areas may be sufficient for a competitive application.
- Each criterion should be supported by evidence of sustained impact ( $\geq 2$  years for Early Career nominees).
- The assessment panel's decision is final and not subject to appeal.
- Nomination statements should represent the nominee's own work, experience, and voice. AI tools may be used to assist with drafting or editing, but the content must be reviewed, verified, and endorsed as accurate by the nominee. Assessors will look for evidence of authentic, specific, and personal reflection — generic or impersonal responses may be rated less favourably.

### **Assessment Criteria**

#### **1. Research Quality and Innovation (60%)**

Criterion: Demonstrates originality, methodological rigour, and contribution to advancing knowledge in construction management or related built environment disciplines.

Examples of Practice:

- Research outputs in high-impact or field-leading journals and other recognised outlets.
- Development of novel research methodologies, frameworks, or analytical tools.
- Early but strong citation impact, or recognition through invited talks.

Possible Evidence:

- List of peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or conference papers.
- Citation metrics (H-index, FWCI, or other field-normalised indicators).
- Statements from mentors or collaborators highlighting innovation.
- Evidence of competitive funding obtained as lead or co-investigator.

#### **2. Research Collaboration and Engagement (20%)**

Criterion: Demonstrates emerging leadership through collaboration with key stakeholders including, academia, industry and community and active contribution to research culture and networks.

Examples of Practice:

- Coordinating small research teams or student supervision (Honours).
- Cross-disciplinary or international research collaborations.
- Organising symposia, workshops, or research networks.

Possible Evidence:

- Supervision records (HDR, Honours, or research assistants).
- Evidence of collaborative publications or multi-institutional projects.
- Roles in organising conferences, panels, or research committees.

- Testimonies from supervisors or collaborators.

### 3. Future Research Trajectory and Potential (20%)

Criterion: Shows a clear and feasible plan for continued research growth and contribution to the discipline.

Examples of Practice:

- Development of a coherent research agenda or roadmap.
- Identification of future funding and collaboration opportunities.
- Engagement with emerging research themes or technologies.

Possible Evidence:

- Research statement outlining 3–5 year goals.
- Funding applications (submitted or under development).
- Mentoring plans or capacity-building activities.

## A2: Mid-Career Research Excellence Award

### Application Guide

- Nominations are assessed against all criteria.
- Applicants must address all four criteria. However, it is expected that nominees will demonstrate greater strength in some areas than others.
- Each criterion should be supported by evidence of sustained impact (typically 3 years and greater).
- The assessment panel's decision is final and not subject to appeal.
- Nomination statements should represent the nominee's own work, experience, and voice. AI tools may be used to assist with drafting or editing, but the content must be reviewed, verified, and endorsed as accurate by the nominee. Assessors will look for evidence of authentic, specific, and personal reflection — generic or impersonal responses may be rated less favourably.

### Assessment Criteria

#### 1. Research Excellence and Innovation (35%)

Criterion: Demonstrates a sustained record of high-quality, original, and influential research contributing significantly to construction management or related built environment disciplines.

Examples of Practice:

- Consistent publication in leading international journals or books with measurable impact.
- Development of theoretical or methodological advances influencing the discipline.
- Recognition as a field leader through keynote invitations, editorial roles, or awards.

Possible Evidence:

- Publication list highlighting top-tier outputs and citation metrics (H-index, FWCI, etc.).
- Evidence of major research funding as Chief Investigator or equivalent.
- Statements from referees attesting to scholarly leadership and innovation.

#### 2. Research Translation (30%)

Criterion: Demonstrates measurable and sustained research translation into industry, policy, community, or professional practice.

Examples of Practice:

- Research adopted in industry guidelines, standards, or government policy.
- Patents, commercialisation, or design/technology implementation.
- Long-term partnerships with industry or government delivering measurable benefits.

Possible Evidence:

- Case studies demonstrating translation or evidence of adoption or outcomes.
- Letters or testimonials from partners, clients, or policymakers.
- Evidence of consultancy income, technology transfer, or societal uptake.
- Media coverage, awards, or citations in professional standards.

### 3. Research Leadership and Mentorship (20%)

Criterion: Shows strong leadership in building research capacity, mentoring emerging researchers, and contributing to institutional or disciplinary development.

Examples of Practice:

- Leadership of multi-institutional or interdisciplinary research teams.
- Supervision and successful completion of HDR students.
- Mentoring of early-career academics or postdoctoral researchers.
- Leadership roles in professional or research associations.

Possible Evidence:

- HDR supervision record and outcomes.
- Description of mentoring activities and mentee achievements.
- Roles in committees, research centres, or journal editorial boards.
- Testimonials from mentees or collaborators.

### 4. Future Research Strategy and Contribution (15%)

Criterion: Articulates a clear, strategic, and feasible plan for future research leadership, collaboration, and impact.

Examples of Practice:

- Development of an international research agenda or large-scale program.
- Plans for interdisciplinary or cross-sector collaboration.
- Integration of sustainability, digital innovation, or social impact goals.

Possible Evidence:

- Strategic research plan (3–5 years).
- Pipeline of funding applications or partnerships.
- Statements of institutional alignment and contribution to strategic priorities.

## A3: Research Impact Award

### Application Guide

- Nominations are assessed against all criteria.
- Applicants must address all four criteria. However, it is expected that nominees will demonstrate greater strength in some areas than others.
- Each criterion should be supported by evidence of sustained impact (typically 2 years and greater).
- Indicative word counts for each criterion are provided in the application form.
- The assessment panel's decision is final and not subject to appeal.
- Nomination statements should represent the nominee's own work, experience, and voice. AI tools may be used to assist with drafting or editing, but the content must be reviewed, verified, and endorsed as accurate by the nominee. Assessors will look for evidence of authentic, specific, and personal reflection — generic or impersonal responses may be rated less favourably.

### Assessment Criteria

#### 1. Nature and Significance of the Research (25%)

Criterion: Demonstrates high-quality, original, research that addresses a significant problem or opportunity in construction management or related built environment disciplines.

## Examples of Practice:

- A multi-disciplinary or cross-institutional research project addressing national or global challenges.
- Development of new knowledge, frameworks, or tools with clear relevance to industry or society.
- Demonstrated excellence through peer-reviewed outputs, recognition, or competitive funding.

## Possible Evidence:

- Summary of the research program (scope, objectives, and collaborators).
- Key publications or outputs from the team.
- Evidence of funding success (e.g., ARC, CRC, or industry partnerships).
- Statements from collaborators demonstrating the project's quality and significance.

**2. Reach and Significance of the Impact (35%)**

Criterion: Demonstrates verifiable and sustained impact of the research on industry, policy, practice, or the wider community.

## Examples of Practice:

- Adoption of research findings in standards, codes, or government policy.
- Implementation of new technologies, digital tools, or management processes.
- Societal or environmental benefits (e.g., improved housing, safety, resilience, or sustainability outcomes).
- Influence on professional practice, education, or industry training.

## Possible Evidence:

- Case studies detailing the pathway from research to impact.
- End-user testimonials (industry, government, or community partners).
- Evidence of changes in practice, regulation, or public awareness.
- Quantitative indicators (e.g., cost savings, productivity improvements, emission reductions).
- Media reports or awards recognising the project's influence.

**3. Collaboration and Partnership Effectiveness (25%)**

Criterion: Demonstrates effective collaboration and partnership across disciplines, institutions, or sectors that enabled the impact.

## Examples of Practice:

- Co-design and delivery with industry, government, or community stakeholders.
- Integration of diverse expertise (technical, social, cultural) to achieve impact.
- Long-term, mutually beneficial partnerships built on trust and shared outcomes.

## Possible Evidence:

- Partnership agreements or Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).
- Statements from partners describing collaboration value and outcomes.
- Evidence of joint outputs, co-authored publications, or shared IP.
- Records of workshops, stakeholder forums, or joint project activities.

**4. Leadership, Capacity Building, and Sustainability (15%)**

Criterion: Demonstrates leadership, mentorship, and strategies that enhance research capability and sustain long-term impact.

## Examples of Practice:

- Mentoring and inclusion of early-career researchers and HDR students.
- Cross-institutional leadership structures or shared governance.
- Training programs or resources developed for partners or end-users.
- Plans for continuing or scaling impact beyond the initial project.

---

**Possible Evidence:**

- Descriptions of team composition and roles.
- Evidence of student involvement or professional development outcomes.
- Documentation of leadership and project management structures.
- Future plans for sustaining partnerships or extending research.

## **Submission Requirements**

- 1. Completed application form** — including the nomination summary, nomination statement addressing all assessment criteria, and team contribution statements where applicable (Research Impact Award only)
- 2. Curriculum Vitae**
  - Early-Career Research Excellence: max. 2 pages, focused on research outputs, funding, supervision, and professional engagement
  - Mid-Career Research Excellence: max. 3 pages, focused on research outputs, funding, supervision, leadership, and professional engagement
  - Research Impact Award: not required
- 3. Letters of reference** — each letter max. one A4 page  
Referee letters should reflect the referee's own genuine assessment of the nominee. AI tools may be used to assist with drafting or editing, but the content must accurately represent the referee's own views and be reviewed and endorsed by them before submission.
  - Early-Career Research Excellence: two referees required. Both may be internal, but at least one must be independent of the nominee's direct research group (e.g. Head of School, mentor). External referees encouraged.
  - Mid-Career Research Excellence: two referees required. At least one must be external (academic peer at another institution, industry collaborator, or professional association).
  - Research Impact Award: two referees required. At least one must be outside the nominee's home institution (e.g. industry partner, collaborator at another university, or professional association).
- 4. Supporting materials** (optional)
  - Up to 10 additional pages of supporting evidence
  - A supplementary digital resource (e.g. website, video, or e-portfolio) may be included by providing the link in the designated field in the application form. Assessment will be based solely on the nomination statement and supporting evidence pages — digital resources are supplementary and will not disadvantage nominees if not provided.