WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD OF MANITOBA

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING WORKPLACE INNOVATION APPLICATIONS

RESEARCH AND WORKPLACE INNOVATION PROGRAM
Funding occupational health research, training and education and innovative workplace solutions

Criteria	Descriptor
DIMENSION 1	**INNOVATION AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER**
• **The project is clearly innovative.** **Innovation can be defined as:** "The act of introducing something new: (The American Heritage Dictionary)."A new idea, method or device" (Webster Online) "Change that indicates a new dimension of performance" (Peter Drucker) • **The proponent has clearly demonstrated that the project uses new or existing knowledge, ideas, processes, products and services to change and improve the health and safety environment of a specific workplace.** • **The project's outcomes will be practical and concrete.** • **The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and/or sharing of project results.**	**High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0** The application **very convincingly** demonstrates that the project is innovative. The project **does not in any way** duplicate other programs or services. The project will **strongly impact** and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. The workplace must be a partner in the project. The project provides **very creative** solutions for specific health and safety problems in an identified workplace. A plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces is an **integral** part of the project. **Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9** The application demonstrates **reasonably well** that the project is innovative. The project **does not appear** to duplicate other programs or services. The project will i**mpact** and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. The workplace must be a partner in the project. The project provides **somewhat creative** solutions for specific health and safety problems in an identified workplace. A plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces is an **integral** part of the project. **Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9** The application appears to be **somewhat** innovative. It is not clear whether the project duplicates other programs or services. The project **may have an impact** and may improve the

Criteria	Descriptor
	health and safety environment of an identified workplace. The workplace must be a partner in the project.
	The project's solution to specific health and safety problems **may be** creative, but it requires further development.
	There is **little or no mention** of sharing outcomes of the project with others.
	Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9
	The application is **not** innovative. It seems to duplicate other programs or services.
	The project is not likely to have an impact on the health and safety environment of a workplace. The project is not being conducted with the full involvement of a workplace.
	The project's solution to specific health and safety problems is not creative or developed.
	There is **no mention** of sharing outcomes of the project with others.
DIMENSION 2	**IMPORTANCE AND RELEVANCE TO THE WCB AND THE WORKPLACE**
• **The issues addressed are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.** • **The project will improve workplace health and safety.** • **The project's activities comply with** *The Workplace Safety and Health Act*	**High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0** The project addresses issues that are **very relevant** and **extremely important** to the WCB. This project has **very strong** potential to **positively impact** workplace health and safety and the project's activities **very clearly supports** *The Workplace Safety and Health Act*. There is **very strong support**, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.

Criteria	Descriptor
• **Project results and products will be relevant in the short and long term.** • **The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and information sharing of results.** • **There is a plan to continue and sustain the project in the workplace after WCB funding.**	There is a **commitment to sustain** the program following the cessation of WCB funding. **Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9** The project addresses issues that are **relevant** and **important** to the WCB. This project has potential to **positively impact** workplace health and safety and the project's activities **supports** *The Workplace Safety and Health Act*. There is **support**, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace. There is a **reasonable plan to sustain** the program following the cessation of WCB funding. **Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9** The project **somewhat** addresses issues that are **relevant** or **important** to the WCB. There may be a positive impact on workplace health and safety and the project's activities are **somewhat in support** of *The Workplace Safety and Health Act*. There is **little** demonstrated **support** for the project from potential end-users in the workplace. There is **some indication** that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding. **Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9** The project addresses issues that are neither **relevant** nor **important** to the WCB. This project is not likely to positively **impact** workplace health and safety and may, in fact have an adverse effect.

Criteria	Descriptor
	The project's activities are **do not support** *The Workplace Safety and Health Act***.**
	There is **no** indication of **support** for the project from workplace parties and potential end-users in the workplace.
	There is **no indication** that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.
DIMENSION 3	**PROJECT MANAGEMENT & RISK ASSESSMENT**
• **There is a comprehensive, reasonable and achievable work-plan to achieve project goals.** • **Critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.** • **The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk.** • **The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the project**	**High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0** The work-plan is **extremely well** developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a **very** practical framework and **realistic** timeframe. It is **extremely likely** that the project will **successfully achieve** its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe. The proponents demonstrate that they have **thoughtfully and critically considered every possible risk** to the project and propose **very realistic and practical** solutions to mitigate potential risks. **Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9** The work-plan is **fairly well** developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a **reasonable** framework and **realistic** timeframe. It is **likely** that the project will successfully achieve its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe. The proponents have identified **some** potential obstacles and propose **workable** alternatives to mitigate potential risks.

Criteria	Descriptor
	Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9
	The work-plan is **reasonably** developed, but the goals and key milestones are **poorly defined**. **The timeframe may not be realistic.**
	It is **uncertain whether** the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.
	The proponents **do not demonstrate that they have given adequate consideration** to potential obstacles and solutions to mitigate risks.
	Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9
	The work-plan is **vague and inadequate**. The work-plan would need to be **reconsidered and re-developed** into an acceptable framework.
	It is **unlikely** that the project will achieve its purposes or be completed within a reasonable timeframe.
	The proponents **have not** undertaken a risk assessment.
DIMENSION 4	**PROJECT BUDGET**
• **The project's resource requirements are well thought out and thoroughly described with clear justification for each budget item. (*Resources include human, physical, financial, and technological*)** • **Financial and in-kind support from the employer and other workplace parties is encouraged, but is not required.**	**High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0** The budget justification is **thorough and very clear.** There is **significant** financial and in-kind support from workplace parties. The project costs are **very reasonable** and do not include the cost of salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project. Budget expenditures and the project milestones are clearly linked and there is no **duplication** of resources or funding from other sources. **Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9**

Criteria	Descriptor
• **Project costs are reasonable and do not include salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project. However, salaries for a new position created expressly for the purposes of the project or fees for consultants who are engaged to manage the project are acceptable budget items.** • **There is no duplication or overlap in funding.** • **There is a clear link between budget line items and the project's work-plan.**	The budget justification is **complete and clear.** There is **either** financial or in-kind support from workplace parties. The projects costs are acceptable and do not include the cost of salaries or benefits for employees participating in the project. The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones could be better explained. There is no **duplication** of resources or funding from other sources. **Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9** The budget justification **is weak** and incomplete**.** There is **minimal** financial or in-kind support from workplace parties. The projects costs are **unreasonably high or low.** Salaries of employees participating in the project may be included and so the budget would need to be reworked. The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones is quite unclear. **There may be some duplication** of resources or funding from other sources and would require clarification. **Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9** The budget justification **is extremely weak** or missing**.** There is **no financial or in-kind** support from workplace parties. The projects costs are **either unreasonably high or low.** Salaries of employees participating in the project may

Criteria	Descriptor
	be included and so the budget would need to be reworked.
	The link between budget expenditures and the project's milestones is quite unclear. **There may be duplication** of resources or funding from other sources and would require clarification.
DIMENSION 5	**EXPERTISE OF THE PROJECT TEAM**
• **The project team has been clearly identified and has the skills to successfully undertake the project.** • **The project leader and/or team members have experience managing projects of a similar size and scope.** • **The project leader has the knowledge, expertise and experience to undertake and bring this project to a successful conclusion.** • **The project leader and project team demonstrate they have the knowledge, experience and credentials in occupational health and safety, injury prevention, RTW, and treatment of occupational illnesses.**	**High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0** The project team has **exceptional knowledge** in all areas related to the proposed project. The project leader has **demonstrated a track record in successfully managing several projects** of this nature. Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is **highly confident** that the applicant will complete the project successfully. **Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9** The project team has **knowledge** in all areas related to the proposed project. The project leader has **successfully managed a similar project.** Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is **reasonably confident** that the applicant will complete the project successfully. **Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9** The project team would need to consider **hiring or purchasing the services of external advisors** with the

Criteria	Descriptor
	knowledge and experience required to undertake the proposed project.
	The project leader **may have participated in similar projects in the past**.
	Given the background, experience and expertise of the project ream, the reviewer is **not certain** that the applicant will complete the project successfully without external assistance.
	Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9
	The project team **must hire or purchase the services of external advisors** in order to be considered for funding.
	The project leader has **never managed or participated in similar projects in the past.**
	Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team. The reviewer is **not confident** that the applicant will complete the project successfully, even with external assistance.