

WORKERS COMPENSATION BOARD OF MANITOBA

**CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
APPLICATIONS**

RESEARCH AND WORKPLACE INNOVATION PROGRAM

*Funding occupational health research, training and education
and innovative workplace solutions*

Criteria	Descriptor
DIMENSION 1	IMPORTANCE AND RELEVANCE TO THE WCB
<p>The proposed study addresses the priority areas in the annual call for applications under the RWIP Scientific Research funding stream.</p> <p>The problems and issues to be studied are frequently encountered among workers and in workplaces.</p> <p>There are a significant number of workers who are impacted by the problems and issues identified by the proposed study.</p> <p>The issues addressed are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.</p> <p>The objectives of the proposed study may not be achieved through existing mechanisms and does not duplicate existing programs or services offered by other organizations.</p>	<p>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study precisely and accurately focuses on the specific research priorities identified in the call for applications in the Scientific Research funding stream. • The proposed study addresses issues that are very relevant and extremely important to the WCB. • It will have an impact on a significant number of workers and workplaces. • Research objectives are extremely well expressed. The proposed study's objectives do not in any way duplicate other studies and will definitely not result in programs or services currently available. <p>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study adequately focuses on the specific research priorities identified in the call for applications in the Scientific Research funding stream. • The proposed study addresses issues that are relevant and important to the WCB. • It will have an impact on a number of workers and workplaces. • Research objectives are clearly expressed. • The proposed study's objectives do not duplicate other studies and will not result in programs or services currently available. <p>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study gives some focus to the specific research priorities identified in the call for applications in the Scientific

Criteria	Descriptor
	<p>Research funding stream.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study somewhat addresses issues that are relevant and important to the WCB. • It will have some impact on workers and workplaces. • Research objectives are not well expressed. • The proposed study's objectives duplicate somewhat other studies and may be similar to programs or services currently available. <p>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study does not give focus to the specific research priorities identified in the call for applications in the Scientific Research funding stream. • The proposed study does not address issues that are relevant and important to the WCB. • It does not have any impact on workers and workplaces. • Research objectives are not at all clear. • The proposed study's objectives duplicate other studies and would definitely be similar to programs or services currently available.
DIMENSION 2	QUALITY OF PROPOSAL
Criteria	Descriptor
<p>The proposed study is well thought-out, original and clearly presented.</p>	<p>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study is very clearly original and most definitely does not duplicate other studies as demonstrated in the literature review.

Criteria	Descriptor
<p>The proposed study addresses un-explored issues or problems in the workplace.</p> <p>Research objectives are clearly described and demonstrate the practical significance of the proposed study.</p> <p>There is a clear explanation of key issues that will be addressed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study is exceptionally well thought out, logical, very practical in approach and very clearly and logically presented. • Research objectives are clearly stated and their relevance to workers compensation is very thoroughly addressed. <p>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study is somewhat original and does not appear to duplicate other studies as demonstrated in the literature review. • The proposed study is well thought out, logical, practical and clearly presented. • Research objectives are clearly stated. Key issues relevant to workers compensation are adequately explored. <p>Needs Revision:1.0-1.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study may duplicate other studies as demonstrated in the literature review. • The proposed study is not well presented, and the overall approach needs to be revamped. • Research objectives are not well expressed. Key issues relevant to workers compensation are explored in cursory fashion. <p>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed study duplicates other

Evaluation Criteria: Scientific Research Applications-RWIP Evaluation Panel

Criteria	Descriptor
	<p>studies as demonstrated in the literature review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="824 331 1485 457">• The proposed study is poorly presented, and the overall approach needs to be revamped.<li data-bbox="824 489 1513 657">• Research objectives are poorly expressed. Key issues relevant to workers compensation are explored very inadequately.