

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
<b>DIMENSION 1</b>	<b>INNOVATION AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER</b>
<p><b>The project is clearly innovative.</b></p> <p><b>Innovation can be defined as:</b>                      “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)</p> <p><b>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 Manitoba workplace.</b></p> <p><b>The project’s outcomes will be practical and concrete.</b></p> <p><b>The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and/or sharing of project results.</b></p>	<p><b>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application <b>very convincingly</b> demonstrates that the project is innovative. The project <b>does not in any way</b> duplicate other programs or services.</li> <li>• The project will <b>strongly impact</b> and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace.</li> <li>• The workplace <b>is a very supportive partner</b> in the project.</li> <li>• The project provides <b>very creative</b> solutions for specific health and safety problems in an identified workplace.</li> <li>• A plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces is an <b>integral</b> part of the project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application demonstrates <b>reasonably well</b> that the project is innovative. The project <b>does not appear</b> to duplicate other programs or services.</li> <li>• The project will <b>impact</b> and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace.</li> <li>• The workplace <b>is a supportive partner</b> in the project.</li> <li>• The project provides <b>somewhat creative</b> solutions for specific health and safety problems in an identified workplace.</li> <li>• A plan to share the outcomes of the project with other workplaces is an <b>integral</b> part of the project.</li> </ul> <p><b>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application appears to be <b>somewhat</b> innovative. It is <b>not clear</b> whether the project duplicates other programs or services.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Descriptor
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project <b>may have an impact</b> and may improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace.</li> <li>• The workplace <b>may be a supportive partner</b> in the project.</li> <li>• The project’s solution to specific health and safety problems <b>may be</b> creative, but it requires further development.</li> <li>• There is <b>little mention</b> of sharing outcomes of the project with others.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application is <b>not</b> innovative. It <b>duplicates</b> other programs or services.</li> <li>• The project is <b>not likely to have an impact</b> on the health and safety environment of a workplace.</li> <li>• The workplace <b>is not a supportive partner</b> in the project.</li> <li>• The project’s solution to specific health and safety problems <b>is not</b> creative or developed.</li> <li>• There is <b>no mention</b> of sharing outcomes of the project with others.</li> </ul>
<b>DIMENSION 2</b>	<b>IMPORTANCE AND RELEVANCE TO THE WCB AND THE WORKPLACE</b>
<p><b>The issues addressed are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.</b></p> <p><b>The project will improve workplace health and safety.</b></p>	<p><b>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project addresses issues that are <b>very relevant</b> and <b>extremely important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>• This project has <b>very strong</b> potential to <b>positively impact</b> workplace health and safety and the project's activities <b>very clearly supports</b> <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>• There is <b>very strong support</b>, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Descriptor
<p><b>The project's activities comply with <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</b></p> <p><b>Project results and outcomes will be relevant in the short and long term.</b></p> <p><b>The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and information sharing of results.</b></p> <p><b>There is a plan to continue and sustain the project in the workplace after WCB funding.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a <b>commitment to sustain</b> the program following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project addresses issues that are <b>relevant</b> and <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>• This project has potential to <b>positively impact</b> workplace health and safety and the project's activities <b>supports</b> <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>• There is <b>support</b>, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>• There is a <b>reasonable plan to sustain</b> the program following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project <b>somewhat</b> addresses issues that are <b>relevant</b> or <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>• There may be a positive impact on workplace health and safety and the project's activities are <b>somewhat in support</b> of <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>• There is <b>little</b> demonstrated <b>support</b> for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>• There is <b>some indication</b> that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project addresses issues that are neither <b>relevant</b> nor <b>important</b> to the WCB.</li> <li>• This project is not likely to <b>positively impact</b> workplace health and safety and may, in fact have an adverse effect.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Descriptor
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project's activities <b>do not support</b> <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</li> <li>• There is <b>no</b> indication of <b>support</b> for the project from workplace parties and potential end-users in the workplace.</li> <li>• There is <b>no indication</b> that the program would be sustained following the cessation of WCB funding.</li> </ul>
<b>DIMENSION 3</b>	<b>PROJECT MANAGEMENT &amp; RISK ASSESSMENT</b>
<p><b>There is a comprehensive, reasonable and achievable workplan to achieve project goals.</b></p> <p><b>Critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.</b></p> <p><b>The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk.</b></p> <p><b>The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the project</b></p>	<p><b>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The workplan is <b>extremely well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>very</b> practical framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>• It is <b>extremely likely</b> that the project will <b>successfully achieve</b> its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>• The proponents demonstrate that they have <b>thoughtfully and critically considered every possible risk</b> to the project and propose <b>very realistic and practical</b> solutions to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The workplan is <b>fairly well</b> developed, goals are clearly defined and critical milestones identified within a <b>reasonable</b> framework and <b>realistic</b> timeframe.</li> <li>• It is <b>likely</b> that the project will successfully achieve its goals and be completed within the proposed timeframe.</li> <li>• The proponents have identified <b>some</b> potential obstacles and propose <b>workable</b> alternatives to mitigate potential risks.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Descriptor
	<p><b>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The workplan is <b>reasonably</b> developed, but the goals and key milestones are <b>poorly defined</b>. <b>The timeframe may not be realistic.</b></li> <li>• It is <b>uncertain whether</b> the project will be completed within a reasonable time frame.</li> <li>• The proponents <b>do not demonstrate that they have given adequate consideration</b> to potential obstacles and solutions to mitigate risks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The workplan is <b>vague and inadequate</b>. The workplan would need to be <b>reconsidered and re-developed</b> into an acceptable framework.</li> <li>• It is <b>unlikely</b> that the project will achieve its purposes or be completed within a reasonable timeframe.</li> <li>• The proponents <b>have not</b> undertaken a risk assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>DIMENSION 4</b>	<b>PROJECT BUDGET</b>
<p>The project’s resource requirements are well thought out and thoroughly described with clear justification for each budget item. <i>(Resources include human, physical, financial, and technological)</i></p> <p>Financial and in-kind support from the employer and other workplace parties is encouraged, but is not required.</p>	<p><b>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget justification is <b>thorough and very clear</b>.</li> <li>• There is <b>significant</b> financial and in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>• The project costs are <b>very reasonable</b>.</li> <li>• Budget expenditures and the project milestones are <b>clearly linked</b>.</li> <li>• There is <b>no duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget justification is <b>complete and clear</b>.</li> </ul>

Criteria	Descriptor
<p><b>Project costs are reasonable and do not include salaries or benefits to back fill positions left vacant by existing 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.</b></p> <p><b>There is no duplication or overlap in funding.</b></p> <p><b>There is a clear link between budget line items and the project’s workplan.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is <b>either</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>• The projects costs are <b>acceptable</b>.</li> <li>• The link between budget expenditures and the project’s milestones could be <b>better explained</b>. There is <b>no duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget justification is <b>weak and incomplete</b>.</li> <li>• There is <b>minimal</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>• The projects costs are <b>unreasonably high or low</b>.</li> <li>• The link between budget expenditures and the project’s milestones is <b>quite unclear</b>.</li> <li>• There may be <b>some duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources and would require clarification.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget justification is <b>extremely weak or missing</b>.</li> <li>• There is <b>no</b> financial or in-kind support from workplace parties.</li> <li>• The projects costs are <b>unreasonably high or low</b>.</li> <li>• The link between budget expenditures and the project’s milestones is <b>unclear</b>.</li> <li>• There is <b>duplication</b> of resources or funding from other sources and would require clarification.</li> </ul>
<b>DIMENSION 5</b>	<b>EXPERTISE OF THE PROJECT TEAM</b>
	<b>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</b>

Criteria	Descriptor
<p><b>The project team has been clearly identified and has the skills to successfully undertake the project.</b></p> <p><b>The project leader and/or team members have experience managing projects of a similar size and scope.</b></p> <p><b>The project leader has the knowledge, expertise and experience to undertake and bring this project to a successful conclusion.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team has <b>exceptional knowledge</b> in all areas related to the proposed project.</li> <li>• The project leader has <b>successfully managed</b> several projects of this nature.</li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>highly confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully.</li> </ul> <p><b>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team is <b>knowledgeable</b> in all areas related to the proposed project.</li> <li>• The project leader has <b>managed</b> projects of this nature.</li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>reasonably confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully.</li> </ul> <p><b>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team would need to consider <b>hiring or purchasing the services of external advisors</b> with the knowledge and experience required to undertake the proposed project.</li> <li>• The project leader <b>may have managed projects</b> of this nature.</li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team, the reviewer is <b>not certain</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully without external assistance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</b></p>

Criteria	Descriptor
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project team <b>must hire or purchase the services of external advisors</b> in order to be considered for funding.</li> <li>• The project leader <b>has never managed</b> projects of this nature.</li> <li>• Given the background, experience and expertise of the project team. The reviewer is <b>not confident</b> that the applicant will complete the project successfully, even with external assistance.</li> </ul>