

# PREPARING THE NOVA AWARD INVESTIGATION REPORT<sup>1</sup>

Authors: Robert B. Harris<sup>2</sup> and Robert I. Carr<sup>3</sup>

The purpose of the Nova Award Investigation Report is to furnish the Nova Award Jury with additional information to that given in the original nomination and to clarify any ambiguities that exist. Information in the report must be clearly understandable by all Jurors, including those who are not engineers. The report must include information from people who are knowledgeable about the subject of the innovation but not directly affiliated with it, including from people not listed in the nomination who are identified during the investigation. Through interviews and internet search, Investigators should identify and report on competing and similar technologies. Jurors need a concise document that evaluates the innovation so they can quickly determine its qualification for the Nova Award.

The Jury bases its decision on four selection criteria: (1) The innovation will be judged on its effect upon the construction process and on facility service. It can be an innovation in the construction process itself or in materials, design, equipment, detailing, contract administration, labor relations, management, training, procurement, maintenance, and use, etc. that improves the construction process and/or facility service. A project can be nominated for its concepts or methods. (2) The innovation must be a proven success. It must have a positive, important effect on construction or service, to improve quality or reduce cost. Innovation is the implementation of new methods and new technologies. It is not merely an idea that has merit and may be successful in the future. It must promote good, acceptable construction practices. (3) The innovation must be a significant advance, not just a natural evolution of existing methods, common sense, or good practice. (4) The innovation must be documentable and presentable. Innovators and their employers must disclose sufficient information about the innovation to allow documentation for the Jury and an informative presentation at the Construction Innovation Celebration.

It is a great help to the Jury if Investigator Reports follow a common format, which also provides guidance to Investigators and reduces any personal bias that might exist among Investigators or Jurors. Therefore Investigators should use the following format as closely as possible. The report should be arranged in sections and with the format (font = Times/Times New Roman at 12 pt except main titles at 14 pt; Margins = 1" top and bottom, 1.25" right and left) that follows. Note the footnotes and footer on the pages that follow. A companion Microsoft Word file "ReportTemplate.doc" has been prepared as a formatted template that an Investigator can use to write the Investigation Report. All elements of an Investigation Report must be in electronic format that can be combined in a single Adobe Acrobat .pdf file that can be distributed to the Jury via the internet.

---

<sup>1</sup> November 9, 1999. Revised April 17, 2008. See revised "Supporting Exhibits."

<sup>2</sup> Professor Emeritus of Civil Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan (Deceased).

<sup>3</sup> Professor Emeritus of Civil Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, (734) 665-8287 (home), [RICarr@umich.edu](mailto:RICarr@umich.edu). Revised October 10, 2007

# **INVESTIGATOR'S SUMMARY<sup>4</sup>**

Nomination 2000-01

Investigator: Ime N. Hicotton<sup>5</sup>

## **SHORT NAME OF INNOVATION**

### **The Innovation**

This section should provide the Jury with a clear, concise description of the innovation. Original nomination statements often do not clearly describe the innovation; they just talk about what it is supposed to do or how good it is. Therefore, this section must provide the following information: a clear, succinct statement as to what the innovation really is and how it works internally to achieve the innovation; a brief narration about how the innovation is applied and how well it performs when it is applied; and a description of the innovation's advantages and disadvantages. This section should address the innovation's effect on construction (Criterion 1).

### **Application of the Innovation**

This section should include information about the way(s) in which the innovation has been applied or used. It should also include projects on which it has been used. This section should expand on Criterion 2.

### **Background of the Innovation**

This section should contain information about the development of the innovation, including its time and place of origination, the names and positions of the responsible parties, how it was tested or validated, and other similar data. It should identify and describe competing and similar technologies, including the common and traditional and the more recent and/or innovative, whether proven, unproven, or failed. This section addresses Criterion 3

### **Responsibility for the Innovation**

This section should identify the persons primarily involved in inventing or developing the innovation and should describe the position and contribution of each. Persons other than those named in the nomination may be included as appropriate. This section should also include the Investigator's recommendation as to which persons or organizations should be recognized by the CIF as being primarily responsible. This recommendation can include those who were particularly important in supporting or implementing the innovation.

---

<sup>4</sup> Month day, year

<sup>5</sup> Professor of Civil Engineering, University of Statename, College Town, Statename.

## **Opinions of Persons Contacted**

This section should summarize the opinions about the innovation given by persons that the Investigator has contacted.

## **Investigator's Comments**

This section permits the Investigator to comment on the way the investigation went. It may include comments about the enthusiasm and cooperation of the persons contacted. After talking to a number of contacts, the Investigator may have come to a conclusion as to the acceptability of the nomination. The Investigator may not have any comments to offer and this is understandable, but these comments do assist the jury, especially if the Investigator cannot be present at the Jury Meeting. This is generally the final section of the Investigator's Summary

## **SELECTED INTERVIEW SUMMARIES**

### **Professor P. Ling Daley**

Department of Civil Engineering

University of the Bays

Nantucket, Massachusetts USA

Telephone interview by Ime N. Hicotton, December 4, 2001

This Selected Interview Summaries section (on a new page with heading above) should list each significant contact made by the Investigator and should present a summary of the pertinent comments by the contact, in the format used here.

## **SUPPORTING EXHIBITS**

- 1. Photograph of the TetraCycler 3000 in action.**
- 2. Drawing of TetraCycler movements during mobilization.**
- 3. Theory of Super Cycling as Exemplified by the TetraCycler 3000**  
By Ice O. Lacion and Over C. Praject, Journal of Cyclination, ASCC, December, 1998, pp 201-209. This exhibit includes the paper title page with abstract, a summary by Ime N. Hicotton, and tables of results. A complete copy of this paper is available on request.
- 4. List of publications on TetraCycler 3000**

This Supporting Exhibits section (on a new page with heading above) is to include additional exhibits concerning the nominated innovation. All Supporting Exhibits must be reduced or easily reducible to Adobe Acrobat .pdf file form to be combined with the body of the Investigation Report for distribution to the Jury. Videotapes, CDRoms, DVDs, and slides are not satisfactory. Supporting Exhibits can range from 2 or 3 pages up to a maximum of 25, and 10 pages is about average. This section should have a cover page in the format shown above that lists the exhibits. It is best if each exhibit also has a label, which may be a simple "Exhibit 2" on the upper or lower right of its page. This will generally be the final section of the Investigation Report.

The electronic file sizes of all elements of the Investigation Report, including Supporting Exhibits must be small enough to produce Adobe Acrobat .pdf files of reasonable size for easy downloading and saving by Jurors. All too often an Investigator includes bloated photographs and scanned materials that swell the final Investigation Report file to 2 Mb or more, which is unnecessary. Simply reducing the physical size of a figure in Microsoft Word does not itself reduce the electronic size of the figure unless it is "Compressed" within the "Picture" tab of "Format Picture". Otherwise, many figures must be downsized before inserting them into the Investigation Report.

An Investigator who gives insufficient attention to selecting and preparing Supporting Exhibits places that burden on the Editor preparing final reports for the Jury. This has been a major problem. Therefore, Investigators must be highly selective. Each Supporting Exhibits page must provide significant information. Do not include a complete report or a set of papers: select individual elements, such as abstracts, individual paragraphs, or figures or paraphrase or summarize contributions yourself. Do not include a page on each of 20 projects: select 2-5 that are most representative.