

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
<p>The project is clearly innovative.</p> <p>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)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The project’s outcomes will be practical and concrete.</p> <p>The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and/or sharing of project results.</p>	<p>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 is a very supportive 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. <p>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application demonstrates reasonably well that the project is innovative. The project does not appear to duplicate other programs or services. • The project will impact and improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. • The workplace is a supportive 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. <p>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application appears to be somewhat innovative. It is not clear whether the project duplicates other programs or services.

Criteria	Descriptor
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project may have an impact and may improve the health and safety environment of an identified workplace. • The workplace may be a supportive 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 mention of sharing outcomes of the project with others. <p>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application is not innovative. It duplicates other programs or services. • The project is not likely to have an impact on the health and safety environment of a workplace. • The workplace is not a supportive partner in the project. • 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
<p>The issues addressed are significant enough to warrant WCB investment.</p> <p>The project will improve workplace health and safety.</p>	<p>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>. • There is very strong support, both over the short and long term, for the project from potential end-users in the workplace.

Criteria	Descriptor
<p>The project's activities comply with <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>.</p> <p>Project results and outcomes will be relevant in the short and long term.</p> <p>The project includes provision for knowledge transfer and information sharing of results.</p> <p>There is a plan to continue and sustain the project in the workplace after WCB funding.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a commitment to sustain the program following the cessation of WCB funding. <p>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>. • 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. <p>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>. • 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. <p>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project's activities do not support <i>The Workplace Safety and Health Act</i>. • 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
<p>There is a comprehensive, reasonable and achievable workplan to achieve project goals.</p> <p>Critical milestones are identified to ensure completion within the specified time.</p> <p>The risk assessment identifies and describes potential risks, adequately assesses each risk and provides measures to mitigate each risk.</p> <p>The proposed alternative approaches are practical and achievable and will not derail the project</p>	<p>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplan 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. <p>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplan 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
	<p>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplan 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. <p>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The workplan is vague and inadequate. The workplan 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
<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>High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Budget expenditures and the project milestones are clearly linked. • There is no duplication of resources or funding from other sources. <p>Adequate to Good: 2.0-2.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget justification is complete and clear.

Criteria	Descriptor
<p>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.</p> <p>There is no duplication or overlap in funding.</p> <p>There is a clear link between budget line items and the project’s workplan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is either financial or in-kind support from workplace parties. • The projects costs are acceptable. • 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. <p>Needs Revision: 1.0-1.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. <p>Seriously Flawed: 0.0-0.9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget justification is extremely weak or missing. • There is no financial or in-kind support from workplace parties. • The projects costs are unreasonably high or low. • The link between budget expenditures and the project’s milestones is unclear. • There is duplication of resources or funding from other sources and would require clarification.
DIMENSION 5	EXPERTISE OF THE PROJECT TEAM
	High to Outstanding: 3.0-4.0

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

Criteria	Descriptor
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 projects of this nature. • 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.